

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
LIBRARY

Regulations Regarding Theses and Dissertations

Typescript copies of theses and dissertations for Master's and Doctor's degrees deposited in the University of Alberta Library, as the official Copy of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, may be consulted in the Reference Reading Room only.

A second copy is on deposit in the Department under whose supervision the work was done. Some Departments are willing to loan their copy to libraries, through the inter-library loan service of the University of Alberta Library.

These theses and dissertations are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the author. Written permission of the author and of the Department must be obtained through the University of Alberta Library when extended passages are copied. When permission has been granted, acknowledgement must appear in the published work.

This thesis or dissertation has been used in accordance with the above regulations by the persons listed below. The borrowing library is obligated to secure the signature of each user.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
ROLES AND RATIONALE FOR ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL COUNSELING

by

MARY CATHERINE CHRISMAS



A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

MAY 1968

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Roles and rationale for elementary school counseling" submitted by Mary Catherine Christmas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

A rationale for elementary school counseling is found in a review of the history of the guidance, testing, child study, and mental health movements reflecting an increased recognition of the need to prevent human failure. Research in child learning demonstrates the interrelationship between learning patterns and personality providing further support for school guidance programs. The United States government's involvement in guidance has also encouraged the growth of elementary school counseling.

The elementary counselor's traditional stress on diagnostic crisis-counseling is slowly giving way to a concept which emphasizes the developmental needs of all children. Many writers urge that the counselor can most effectively carry out this goal as a consultant to the classroom teacher. This would help create better learning environments. Counseling and coordinative roles are also thought important ones for the counselor.

At present, much confusion exists in pupil personnel guidance functions because of many counselor's tendency to perform psychologist and social worker tasks in addition to counseling ones. This is one of the major problems found in the resurgence of the elementary counseling movement which initially began four decades ago.

Comparatively little research exists on guidance specialists' perceptions of their own and other's functions. This lack of research

led to a role and function study in Edmonton, Alberta of 93 school staff members. Questionnaires were administered to teachers and administrators in 18 elementary schools which have counseling services as well as to remedial specialists, psychologists and social workers who serve them. In addition, the pupil personnel administrators responsible for school district special services took part in the study.

Results from the study indicate that the counselor is perceived as performing diagnostic and testing functions as well as parent and community related ones, in addition to child counseling. Of the six pupil personnel roles on the questionnaire, counselors were assigned the greatest mean number of points for functions. This indicates one aspect of the need for counselors. Teachers as a group assigned the least number of functions to the counselors, while administrators assigned the most.

Results further show that the proposed increase in counselor involvement in curriculum development and in-service training of teachers, is yet to be reflected in perceptions of Edmonton guidance personnel. The counselors in the present study appear in a state of transition from an old "traditionalist" role to a new "developmentalist" one.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has evolved with the help of many persons. First, the writer wishes to thank her supervisor, Dr. Jay Bishop whose encouragement and patient help were always available, and other committee members, Dr. D. Fair, Dr. H.W. Zingle, and Dr. D. Friesen who offered constructive comments and suggestions. Special thanks also are expressed to Dr. T. Maguire who wrote computer programs and assisted with statistical interpretation.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of Edmonton Public School Board pupil personnel staff, and administrators and teachers in the 18 schools studied. Grateful appreciation is expressed to the elementary school counselors for their interest and assistance. Graduate student colleagues are also thanked for their participation in the pilot study, and helpful criticisms, comments and encouragement.

Finally, the writer is grateful to her husband for his tolerance during the long thesis writing period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION.	1
II	RATIONALE FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.	3
	Guidance in this decade.	10
	Educational goals and research support.	15
III	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO THE NATURE OF GUIDANCE AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL ROLES AND FUNCTIONS.	21
	Definition of Terms.	21
	Nature of Elementary School Guidance.	22
	Roles and Functions of Guidance Personnel.	26
	Counselor roles.	29
	Consulting.	29
	Counseling.	31
	Coordination.	33
	Combination role.	34
	Developmentalist role.	34
	Counselor functions.	36
	Vocational guidance.	37
	Testing diagnosis.	39
	Research.	40
	Other functions.	41
	Trends.	42

CHAPTER	PAGE
Teacher.	44
Principal.	45
Other personnel.	45
Differentiation Between Counselor, Social Worker and Psychologist Roles.	47
School social worker.	47
School psychologist.	48
Similarities and differences in roles.	49
IV NEED FOR THE STUDY AND INVESTIGATION ON PROCEDURES .	51
Need For The Study.	51
Related Studies of Counselor Role and Functions .	51
Purpose of the Present Study.	53
Study Suppositions.	54
Method of Investigation.	56
The population.	56
The instrument.	56
Data Analysis.	57
Limitations.	58
Pilot Study.	59
V THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS.	60
Assignment of Role Responsibility.	60
Classification of Functions.	60
Description of Tables.	62
Teacher functions.	63
Administrator functions.	64

CHAPTER

PAGE

Remedial specialist and social worker	
functions.	65
Psychologist functions.	72
Counselor functions.	72
Selected guidance functions.	77
Correlation results.	84
Related findings.	89
Study Suppositions.	92
Interpretation of Findings.	96
Factors influencing the present study.	97
VI SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.	99
Summary.	99
Implications.	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	102
APPENDICES.	112
APPENDIX A "Whose Job Is It?" Questionnaire.	113
APPENDIX B Form letter to study participants.	118

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	<p>AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY INCLUDED ON ROLE- FUNCTION QUESTIONNAIRE AND ROLES ASSIGNED TO THEM BY SUBJECT GROUP N=93.</p>	61
II.	<p>FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO TEACHERS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY TEACHERS; SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS; SOCIAL WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS; AND PUPIL PERSONNEL ADMIN. N=86.</p>	66
III.	<p>ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS) SHOWED MOST DIS- AGREEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE TEACHING STAFF OR SOME OTHER ROLE SHOULD HAVE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY.</p>	68
IV.	<p>FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO ADMIN. STAFF AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY TEACHERS; SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS; SOCIAL WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS; AND PUPIL PERSONNEL ADMIN. N=86.</p>	69
V.	<p>ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS) SHOWED MOST DIS- AGREEMENT REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES.</p>	70

TABLE

PAGE

VI.	FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS AND SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY ALL RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING SCHOOL COUNSELORS).	71
VII.	FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO SCHOOL PSYCHOLO- GISTS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY ALL GROUPS (EXCLUDING SCHOOL COUNSELORS).	73
VIII.	FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO COUNSELORS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY TEACHERS; SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS; SOCIAL WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS; AND PUPIL PERSONNEL ADMIN. N=86.	74
IX.	ITEMS FIVE JUDGES SELECTED AS INVOLVING A COUNSELING RELATIONSHIP; AND THE ROLE ASSIGNED MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY BY MAJORITY OF STUDY SUBJECTS N=93.	75
X.	ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS) SHOWED MOST DIS- AGREEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE COUNSELOR OR PSYCHOLOGIST SHOULD HAVE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY.	76
XI.	SELECTED ITEMS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN PERSONNEL GROUP'S PERCEPTIONS OF WHO SHOULD PERFORM CERTAIN GUIDANCE FUNCTIONS.	79

TABLE	PAGE
XII.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR GROUP'S (N=7) ROLE PERCEPTION AND OTHER STAFF GROUP'S ROLE PERCEPTIONS BASED ON TOTAL POINT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE N=93. 86
XIII.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER GROUP'S (N=51) ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS. 86
XIV.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN REMEDIAL SPECIALIST GROUP'S (N=5) ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS. 87
XV.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL WORKER GROUP'S (N=3) ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS. 87
XVI.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR GROUP'S (N=18) ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS. 88
XVII.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S GROUP (N=5) ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS. 88
XVIII.	INSTANCES OF 100% AGREEMENT WITHIN RESPONDING GROUPS ON THE ASSIGNMENT OF MAJOR RESPON- SIBILITIES ON 63 QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR EACH STAFF ROLE. 90

TABLE

PAGE

XIX.	MEAN NUMBER OF POINTS ASSIGNED TO EACH PUPIL PERSONNEL ROLE ON THE 63 ITEMS OF THE "WHOSE JOB IS IT?" QUESTION- NAIRE BY EACH SCHOOL STAFF GROUP N=93.	91
XX.	STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TABLE XIX MEANS OF PUPIL PERSONNEL ROLE FUNCTIONS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study originated as an attempt to formulate a job description for elementary school counselors. Such a task raised many fundamental, but perplexing questions. What is, or should be the role of this relatively new professional person? Who or what defines which functions he performs? On what theory are these decisions made? And, most importantly, what is the educational need or rationale for establishing this new role?

Conflicting opinions are found regarding the role and subsequent functions of the elementary school counselor. A need for continued research on existing perceptions of the counselor's role is stressed. Counselor educators across America agree that formulation of a role must be based on an appropriate rationale. This thesis represents an effort to (1) build such a rationale for guidance personnel, particularly the counselor; (2) propose appropriate roles in light of the rationale; and (3) test these role proposals in the schools of Edmonton, Alberta.

Reasons for elementary school guidance and its major resource--the counselor, are found in a review of the shaping forces of the guidance movement from present-day social problems, from educational needs and research in child learning.

All such forces lead to an acceptance of the currently proposed developmental guidance concept. Emphasis placed upon developmental theory in counseling means rejection of the traditional clinical problem-centered approach. New role definitions in harmony with developmental guidance principles are emerging-- those which concern the developmentalist

counselor who focuses in her work on consultation and counseling with classroom teachers.

The local descriptive inquiry of role perceptions of guidance personnel discussed later in this study reflects many trends indicated in the literature, in addition other needs are suggested in the development of the elementary school counselor's role.

CHAPTER II

RATIONALE FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Fifty, or even 25 years ago, elementary school guidance and counseling was nearly invisible in the American educational scene. The concept of specialized assistance for developing school children from sources other than teachers was almost inconceivable. Formal guidance programs in the elementary schools had not been publicly conceived although isolated instances of such programs were found in the United States as early as 1928. Only in the past decade has public interest concentrated so intensely on this new area. Guidance and counseling at the elementary school level is young and in a rapid state of flux. Clarification of its future growth is achieved through a chronological look at its interrelated historical, theoretical and psychological roots. This provides a rationale and base for contemporary elementary school guidance programs, and the profession of elementary school counseling.

Faust (1968) divides the elementary school counseling movement into three periods. The first, traditionalist or old elementary school counselor, occurred from about 1930 to 1950. During this time, counselors who were few in number, modeled their role after the secondary school counselor's emphasizing vocational choice and occupational information. They concentrated on clinical diagnosis, testing, and one-to-one "crisis" counseling. From the fifties until about 1965, the neo traditionalist emerged, or old elementary school counselor in transition. Less emphasis was given occupational information and testing. Instead work with teachers, parents, and groups of children

as well as individuals, increased. However, prevention was still based on undoing problems, rather than on providing a school climate in which fewer problems developed. Two or three years ago, the developmentalist or new elementary school counselor appeared. This new role is described in Chapter III.

What influences, needs, philosophies, movements and leaders appeared during the traditionalist and neo traditionalist periods which influenced the direction of guidance and counseling and the start of developmentalism?

Prior to the twentieth century in America traditional guidance functions such as aiding a person in time of need, or helping him to decide on the best course of action, were provided largely through families and the church. Schools were primarily concerned with educating an individual's informational domain and in instilling in him society's cultural and religious values. Only limited help appears to have been given school children to maximize their potentials as human beings.

As free education for all became a function of the state and schools became more democratic and willing to provide for the differing needs of individuals; schools in effect were becoming ready to take on a more formal guidance function (Beck, 1963).

It is not surprising that the public school's first formal guidance program was a vocational one occurring after the Industrial Revolution. The revolution's focus on the economic nature of man and the social problems that were created during this period undoubtedly provided the climate for Frank Parsons' initiation of the Boston Vocational Bureau in 1908. His principles of individual self-analysis,

expert vocational advice, and occupational information which influence the whole of educational guidance today, were soon incorporated into many high schools.

Parson's Bureau began in response to pressing social and economic needs. It did not begin because of a need felt by educational staffs or society for better development of adolescents. Services in response to pupil needs came about much later, possibly as a result of three events which occurred at about the same period as Parson's Choosing a Vocation was published, a year after his death. As noted by Beck (1963) these were:

1. Serious study in retardation in education thus centering attention of researchers on the area of individual differences in any given random sampled group.
2. Inquiry into the problems of industrial turnover rate and the causal factors behind quitting, sporadic employment and misemployment. The need for remedying these social problems was well established.
3. G. Stanley Hall's invitation to Sigmund Freud to speak at Clark University thus introducing Freudian ideas to a number of leading figures in American psychology (p. 25).

Within three years after the First National Conference on Vocational Guidance in 1910, and five years after Freud's historic visit, several large American cities had begun establishing widely organized guidance services for the secondary schools.

A second aspect of formal school guidance came as the result of another societal need. When in 1917, the United States became involved in the First World War many problems emerged related to assessing capabilities of the troops. Successful solution of these monumental

problems resulted in an age of testing and "scientific" assessment of human beings. Much of this testing emphasis is still prevalent today. Creation of the Army Alpha and Army Beta intelligence tests and the 1916 Stanford Revision of the Binet Scale began influencing manpower selection in industry and educational placement of children. This coupled with the development of aptitude, interest, achievement, and personality inventories, became a prime focus for educational and psychological experimentation.

During the post World War I period the famous Western Electric studies added a new dimension to psychological thinking: internal needs and social forces were more important to humans than external-monetary factors. However, this finding's impact was not felt until much later (Homans, 1950).

At this time "Guidance was attempting to move from the informal, theologically influenced, intuitive type of folk medicine in choice-making to an objective, test-centered, formal analysis of problems dealing with inter-personal (and, often, intrapersonal) difficulties" (Beck, 1963, p. 25)

Guidance wasn't thought of as belonging to any one discipline-- it was a broad social responsibility demanding the cooperation of a variety of social institutions. Schools were not yet considered a major environment for providing either vocational or mental health services.

Before the third decade began, elementary school counseling was foreshadowed in William Burnham's The Normal Mind (1924) and Great Teachers and Mental Health (1926). Burnham contended that pupils' mental health and teachers' mental health were the most significant factors

in the effective intellectual functioning of pupils. He stated "The child's first business is to grow and develop. Everything else can wait, but the demands of health are imperative." Credited with founding elementary school counseling, Burnham was ahead of his time in viewing children within a framework of the normal educative process (Faust, 1968, p. 13). His third work The Wholesome Personality was published later in 1932 at the same time as J. M. Brewer's Education as Guidance. Brewer was one of the first to nearly equate education and guidance even though educators and counselors did not particularly relate efforts to help individuals vocationally (or psychologically) to total school programs (Miller, 1961).

During the 1930's the great Progressive Education movement, led by John Dewey, was responsible for broad changes in school curriculum and the formation of new educational objectives which in turn had considerable influence on the concept of school guidance. For the first time in practice guidance was viewed as an integral part of education.

Another development during the middle and later 1930's, during and following the Great Depression, was major involvement by the federal government in vocational guidance, problems of unemployment and job placement (Miller, 1961).

Also during this growth-packed period, a re-evaluation of the goals and uses of testing in guidance, education and psychology, took place, although the use and number of tests available continued to grow rapidly (Miller, 1961). It was not until this decade too, that Freud's ideas began to have any impact on guidance practices or philosophy. For the counselor Freud's was probably most influential in

defining the nature of man. Obviously the way counselors viewed man would determine counseling procedures and outcomes. If the individual was driven by conflicting unconscious motivation, drives and instincts, as Freud supposed, then such things as decision making and vocational choice did not necessarily come from straight-forward rational thinking.

E. G. Williamson's How to Counsel Students published in 1939, 20 years after Freud noted the existence of inner human drives, needs and conflicts, was the first systematic, psychologically rooted work dealing with the various phases of the precounseling and counseling interview (Lee and Pallone, 1966; Miller, 1961). However, immediately after the United States' entry into World War II, the real revolution in counseling occurred. Carl Rogers published his Counseling and Psychotherapy (1942) an event which was again to create a re-examination of the nature of man and to the processes and goals of counseling. The concept of man as primarily an economic animal was slowly dying and "psychological man" was experiencing birth (Maslow, 1954).

Roger's introduction of nondirective techniques in counseling gave little if any emphasis on diagnosis, so testing, and mysteries of the unconscious, had no significant role in his conceptions. In contrast to Freudian premises, Rogers conceived of man as basically good, able to make his own choices in a self-enhancing manner. The counselor's unconditional acceptance of the client as a human being was basic to the counseling process. Hence, a new guidance philosophy emerged at a time when the clinical approach to scientific study of the individual was rapidly gaining momentum.

During the 1940's and 1950's when guidance became enmeshed with

the mental health movement, many professionals like Rogers and Maslow, turned their attention to what is now thought of as "existential man" with a focus on man's "self-actualization" or "becoming". Also during these decades the child study movement was in full force and communities all over the United States were establishing guidance clinics to diagnose and treat children with problems. Concepts of fixed intelligence, pre-determined development, and developmental "stages" were firmly held by child educators and specialists, however Havighurst's developmental concept related to meeting pupil needs was gradually gaining acceptance toward the end of that period. His identification of developmental tasks and their relationship to different age groups was setting the stage, as it were, for a more developmentally rooted elementary school guidance.

From the early 1930's until the fifties, guidance in elementary schools was viewed as inseparable from good teaching. Such techniques as grouping and curriculum modification carried out by skillful teachers, constituted the greater part of child guidance. As mental health services became available to increasing numbers of people in the 40's and 50's, specialists such as social workers and clinical psychologists began serving many schools to identify and treat children with severe problems. These professionals and the few elementary counselors in existence, saw remediation as a paramount goal of specialized guidance services. This problem-solving emphasis of the neo traditionalist period (Faust, 1968) continues today in a majority of schools (Koeppe, 1966) and is a major hurdle in bringing about a new and broader developmental concept of elementary school guidance and counseling.

In summary, "Two broad trends in personal assistance have

characterized the first half of this century, those of vocational guidance and psychotherapy (Wrenn 1951, p. 414)." These trends resulted from several influences on the guidance movement: federal government involvement; interest in progressive education; the rise of clinical psychology; growing demand for mental health services; and introduction of non-directive counseling.

The tenets of both vocational guidance and psychotherapy seem to support the growth of elementary guidance and counseling today. Discussion of these aspects will follow later in the chapter.

Guidance in This Decade

A threat to United States survival almost greater than the two previous world wars occurred in October of 1957 when Russia announced the launching of Sputnik I, the first man-made satellite to orbit the earth. The space age had dawned and with it a frantic reassessment of educational goals, content, and teaching practices in the United States. Within a year after Sputnik, the U.S. government adopted the National Defense Education Act. This was designed to assist secondary school students, particularly the gifted in science and mathematics, to maximize development of their intellectual abilities. Part A of Title V of the Act offered enticing federal monies to states carrying out the mandatory stipulation of submitting a plan to identify and test secondary school students with outstanding ability. Participating states were also required to plan a program of guidance and counseling for secondary school students.

Two years later, in 1960, one year before the Russian cosmonaut

was to venture into space and return alive, a second major development in guidance history took place. The United States government initiated the Whitehouse Conference on Children and Youth. Some 7600 laymen and professional leaders met in Washington D. C. to discuss current social problems related to children and adolescents and to attempt to formulate proposals for their study and amelioration. Significant needs for social action related to young children were shown in these findings:

1. In 1955 more than 212,000 children under the age of 21 had been treated in various psychiatric clinics for emotional disturbances (Children in a Changing World, 1960, p. 39).
2. In a sample of 500 persistent delinquents from the underprivileged areas of Boston, the average age of onset of maladapted behavior was somewhat over eight years, with almost half of the group showing clear signs of anti-sociality at seven or younger, and nine-tenths at ten or younger (Glueck and Glueck, 1959, p. 114-116).

Statistics from other sources supporting this data include:

3. A 1961 California State Department of Education study estimated that between 5 and 10 percent of the children enrolled in public schools have emotional handicaps of sufficient severity that they are unable to learn in school the way other children can (Smallenburg, 1964, p. 65).
4. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the U. S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, estimated in 1958, that 3.3 percent of the population aged 10 - 17 were delinquent, but that there was a larger group, possibly 5 percent of youth, who were semi-delinquent. They do poorly in school, cause disturbances and drop out when they are 16 years old (These figures have undoubtedly increased in the last ten years with the general increase in crime rate).

Conference members also recognized the pressures and problems resulting from (1) increasing mobility; (2) both parents working resulting in limited family interaction; (3) more broken homes; (4)

greater pressures to achieve; and (5) for mature social behavior

It was undoubtedly knowledge such as this that led them to strongly recommend... "that guidance and counseling begin in the elementary school with educational and vocational planning based on early, continuous, and expanded testing and diagnostic appraisal of each child, in order to identify abilities, weaknesses, and problems--mental, physical and emotional." The first part of their recommendation seems an echo of the National Defense Education Act aimed at secondary school students, but the last few words concerning the identification of mental, physical and emotional problems of all children seems to offer a newer view of guidance.

James B. Conant, the great education critic and commentator of the mid-twentieth century in America, also recommended in The American High School Today (1959) that in a satisfactory school system counseling should start in the elementary school.

Other indirect support for expanded elementary guidance programs came from the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban areas which followed the 1962 White House Conference. It was reported that:

During the 1960's, the Department of Labor estimates, some 7.5 million youngsters will drop out before high school graduation. About 2.5 million will not go beyond the eighth grade; two out of three will go no further than the tenth grade...Most dropouts come from lower-income families. A high proportion are classified as 'slow learners' though many may have higher intelligence than their I.Q. tests indicate and simply lack incentive to perform better. Most dropouts are weak in reading and arithmetic and are likely to have a consistent record of subject

or grade failure starting in elementary school." (Social Dynamite, 1961, p. 15-16).

The surge and success of secondary school guidance programs as a result of massive federal assistance, together with the findings of two outstanding conferences related to American youth, have undoubtedly provided the congressional push which resulted in the 1964 extension of Title V of the National Defense Education Act to include elementary school guidance. Hopefully the nation's social needs as well as its manpower needs could be met through programs of massive identification and prevention in the early years of a child's schooling. This was the beginning of what Faust (1968) terms the developmentalist counseling period.

Meeks (1967, p.167) says that the...."significant movements of the twentieth century have created a demand for early identification of individual differences so that human resources might be developed and utilized and serious maladjustments prevented." As Meeks suggests this demand seems to call for a guidance specialist who can work with teachers and parents as well as children. One who can cast aside the traditional remedial problem-centered diagnostic role of mental health in favor of a more positive preventative one. This description seems to this writer to fit the elementary school counselor or consultant - a figure who has been slowly emerging into this new role for more than a decade. However, current federal involvement in support of elementary school guidance has not ended with the 1964 NDEA extension. The Elementary and Pre-School Child Development Act, House Bill 11322 was introduced in the 89th Congress in 1966 and again in 1967 with revision in the 90th

Congress. There is much favorable support for the bill which Nelson, (1967) predicted would be enacted upon early this year. However, financial pressures created by the Vietnam War will probably mean at least a 1970 date for passage of the bill. The bill would provide funding for the preparation of child development specialists to:

1. assist elementary school personnel with the individual learning and behavior problems of elementary school children, as well as with the educational progress of such children;
2. assist school personnel in the recognition of elementary school children who have or who are developing serious emotional, learning, or behavior problems, and in making effective school-related changes to help such children; and
3. assist teachers, parents, and school staff to become knowledgeable about community and other resources for the use of such children and families requiring assistance in the solution of such problems of elementary school children (HR 11322, 89th Congress, pp. 20-21).

The American Personnel and Guidance Association has taken a stand opposing the bill because it feels the bill is too restrictive in nature as the assistance of the child development specialists would be limited to children under the fourth grade. The Association also feels that introducing a new professional title to the already overcrowded pupil personnel field would further confuse the status of the elementary school counselor. The Association would recommend instead that the elementary school counselor function in a role that provides counseling and consultant services for all children and teachers at all grade school levels.

It would appear to the writer that since personnel are not available to adequately serve all elementary schools, that the bill is a realistic attempt to concentrate efforts where long range effects would be felt most strongly. Perhaps a new title emerging from a definite, legislatively supported role would give elementary counseling a clearer direction for development.

Educational goals and research support. The relationship between educational and guidance goals should be considered before the possible roles for an elementary school counselor are dealt with. In addition it is important to view recent psychological and educational research which implies support for the rationale for developmental counseling theory and guidance programs.

Meeks (1967) states that the rationale for a counseling program in the elementary school grows out of the purposes for education and may be summarized in the following statements:

"The purpose which runs through and strengthens all other educational purposes--the common thread of education--is the development of the ability to think" (Educational Policies Commission, 1961).

"An individual's thinking is affected by such personal factors as motives, emotions, attitudes, needs, self-concept, habits, skills and capacity" (Michaelis, 1963, in Meeks p. 178).

Cottingham (1966^b) also believes that the goals of elementary education offer a sufficient range within which to subsume the objectives of the guidance function. He presents Dr. Duane Brown's suggestion that the two broadly categorized sources of objectives to meet pupils needs are (1) studies of learners (psycho-social concerns); and (2) studies of

society (cultural heritage). Activities developed to implement these goals are sometimes dichotomized into guidance and instruction, although neither is mutually exclusive. Cottingham, (1956), Strang (1953), Miller (1961) and others take the position that the concept of guidance emphasizes experiences dealing with problems, decisions, values and plans, while instruction places more stress on the acquisition of skills, facts, concepts and communication.

A major purpose of guidance work at the elementary school level is to help the child develop a sense of confidence in meeting environmental demands and to explore personal choices with him. "The outcomes of this goal, if successful, should be an awareness by the child of his unique self as the central figure in a meaningful existence, strengthened by freedom derived from responsible interaction with life's challenges." Another non-academic learning associated with guidance is pupil assistance in making decisions resolving personal concerns and working toward emotional maturity. This goal of personal adequacy stresses removal of intrapersonal conflicts which, when reduced or eliminated, give the child freedom to accept himself and thus to be able to function at a higher intellectual level (Cottingham, 1966b, p. 65). Influence of Rogers and Maslow is evident in Cottingham's philosophy.

Other purposes of guidance activity with elementary children are those of (1) encouraging social development, including not only interpersonal communication skills, but an appreciation for and identification with value judgments expected by society; and (2) aiding youth to acquire an understanding of the role of education, work, and leisure time in an

increasingly complex occupational world (Cottingham, 1966b).

As Patouillet (1957) notes, guidance is seeking a greater degree of self discovery and fulfillment through educational experiences which are meaningful to the individual.

The stress on the individual and individualization of experiences is one of North American's primary values which interestingly has served to create the guidance function which is itself (Meeks, 1967) a unique phenomenon of American democracy.

Recent research studies have serious implications for education and further support the need for elementary school guidance (reported in Meeks, 1967, p. 167):

1. Failure to achieve in school can cause emotional disturbance and contribute to anti-social behavior (Miller, 1958).
2. School dropouts represent a disproportionate number of all the adolescents in penal institutions and those young people on relief (Wattenberg and Foltz, 1963).
3. The school dropout is apt to become one of the hard core of unemployables (Wattenberg and Foltz, 1963).
4. Underachievement in school is a basic factor in determining whether an individual becomes a school drop-out (Lichter, et al. 1963).
5. More than half of all school drop-outs have average or better than average intelligence (Maryland State Department of Education, 1963).
6. Boys probably begin underachieving in Grade 1 (with the gap between ability and achievement widening in each succeeding grade) (Shaw and McCuen, 1960).
7. Many non-achievers show evidence of relatively serious chronic neurotic problems. Learning disorder is associated with these (U. S. Office of Education, 1962).

8. Stifling creativity may ultimately result in overwhelming tension and in breakdown (Patrick, 1955).

The contributions of the early elementary school years to the forming of the child's basic attitudes, goals, and values is highlighted in a 30 year study released by the Fels Research Institute (Kagan and Moss, 1962). Since adult personality is initially forming during these years, the report stresses that increasing emphasis must be given to the years between the ages of six and ten. Childhood achievement of boys, for example, has shown to be highly correlated to adult male achievement.

Bloom (1964) in a summary of longitudinal studies of educational achievement, indicated that approximately fifty percent of general achievement at grade twelve was actually reached by the end of grade three. And, the child who has an adequate self-concept functions better socially and academically (Walsh, 1956). This is corroborated by Coopersmith (1959), who found a correlation between a positive self-concept and school achievement (in Dinkmeyer, 1968).

These studies indicate the need for a supportive educational environment which will help all children to attain positive self-concepts and to enable them to enjoy satisfying interpersonal relationships both within school and out of school. Such an environment would free children to learn (Faust, 1966). Creation of this mentally healthy climate is basic to the developmental theory of guidance which focuses on helping all children, not just the severely disturbed, meet the problems experienced in normal growth and development. This in turn helps to create an optimal readiness for school learning.

Blocher (1968) defines human development "as those change processes in the physical, mental and emotional components of personality that are continuous and orderly and which proceed in valued directions." He points out that there are several rather fundamental premises which distinguish developmental counseling from other approaches to behavior change. One of these is the dual focus that developmental counseling gives to both process and product in behavior intervention. Blocher emphasizes that specific behavior or behavior patterns are not merely end points or final products. Rather, they are representative of life stages through which the developing individual moves. Each new pattern of behavior is dynamic and points the direction for new stages of development. From this view the behavior patterns that describe goals cannot be considered apart from the processes by which those behaviors were shaped (Blocher, 1968, p. 165).

In a developmental sense the end can never justify the means. Instead, means-ends concepts must always remain linked into the total and continuous process of human development, according to Blocher (1968). He develops this theory with an excellent example:... "even though reasonable conformity to social and institutional expectations is certainly desirable in children, if that conformity is obtained through processes that also produce alienation, rejection, or disparagement of self and others, the price of such adjustment is too high (Blocher, 1968, p. 166)."

Another fundamental premise underlying the developmental counseling approach concerns the nature of human motivation and the consequent patterns of adaptation available to human beings. Man besides being motivated to reduce levels of stimulation also seeks active control of

his environment. Man is a tension-reducing animal who is also a reactive being. He is also a creature who paradoxically needs increasingly high levels of stimulation and mastery in his environment. This has been variously called exploratory drive, need for mastery, or self-actualization (Blocher, 1968).

Facilitating the development of human effectiveness thus involves two basic functions: (a) designing learning situations in which appropriate patterns of coping and mastery behavior can be achieved; and (b) designing social systems which maximize opportunities for all members to develop as effective human beings (Blocher, 1968).

Carrying out these two basic functions implies the need for a carefully structured guidance program in which all personnel involved work together toward similar goals. It also seems to call for a person specifically trained in aiding human development and effectiveness who recognizes the interrelationship of affective and intellectual processes. The person best qualified for the leadership role in this area seems to be the elementary school counselor. He, along with the classroom teacher, principal, school social worker, school psychologist and other specialists, must carry out the specific tasks which best contribute to the realization of the two broader functions mentioned above. The relationship of these team members to each other is shown in a review of the literature on the roles and functions of guidance personnel. The position of the counselor is emphasized.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO THE NATURE OF GUIDANCE AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Guidance. The term guidance in the context of this paper refers to a group of functions or services carried out in an educational setting by trained personnel for the purpose of aiding healthy psychological and intellectual growth of individuals and groups.

Counseling. Counseling refers to a function, a personal relationship, and a process in which a professionally trained counselor assists another person or small group to communicate and to meet immediate and future personal needs. This process facilitates growth through changes in perception, conviction, attitudes and behavior (Dinkmeyer, 1968, p. 221). Counseling is one of the primary services of a guidance program. In its broadest sense, counseling is a role, however it is usually one of several counselor functions.

Role. Role was interpreted as a behavioral repertoire characteristic of a person or a position; and a set of standards, descriptions, norms or concepts held by anyone for the behaviors of a person or a position (Biddle and Thomas, 1966). Counselor as mediator between the child, home and school would be an example of role; or role could include the functions of talking with children privately; working with small

groups of children; and listening to parents express feelings about relationships with their children. In common usage role is a part or function taken or assumed by any person or structure. For the purpose of this paper, the word function will be restricted to the following use.

Function. Function was used to mean a particular task, duty, or behavior--a subset of role. Several functions performed according to certain expectations would constitute a role. Likewise a function could embody one or several tasks. For example, a testing function might include selecting tests; and administering, scoring, and interpreting tests to pupils.

Responsibility. Responsibility was interpreted as the overseeing of a task, duty or function, usually, though not always, involving the direct carrying out of a function.

II. NATURE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE

A rationale for elementary school guidance and the counselor has been drawn from historical events, social problems, manpower needs, and research related to learning and personality. This led to a developmental theory of guidance and counseling. At this time a description of the nature of the guidance program will provide a framework for assigning roles and functions to guidance personnel.

Cottingham (1963, p.340) summarizes seven approaches to elementary school guidance which have appeared in the literature during the

last 15 years.

1. Services approach. Involves the transplant and modification of secondary school guidance. Writers supporting this concept include Hatch (1951), and Bernard, Zeran and James (1954).
2. Guidance is good teaching. Among the more recent proponents are Willey and Dunn (1964), and Barr (1958).
3. Mental health or problem-centered approach. Supporters are Detjen and Detjen (1952) and Kowitz and Kowitz (1964).
4. School psychologist or specialist. Depends on highly trained professionals who also do therapy. Advocates are Driscoll (1955) and Cutts (1955).
5. Human development approach to child study. The premise is that everyone in the school has much knowledge of child development so no specialists are needed. This idea was advanced by Ira Gordon (1952), Prescott (1945), and the Los Angeles County handbook Guidance for Today's Children (1954).
6. Coordinated approach. The role of the teacher is to bring all resources to bear to help the child. Those who share this view include Martinson and Smallenburg (1958), Strang (1953), and Johnston Peterson and Evraiff (1959).
7. Integrative or individualistic approach. Tenets are guidance and instruction are inseparable, and case studies provide a major guidance method. Writers associated with this idea include Lloyd-Jones (1958), Barry and Wolf (1957), and Cottingham (1956).

There is agreement in these seven approaches that the teacher is the key person in guidance and that there is some need for diagnosis.

According to Hill (1966, p. 70) whose ideas are quoted widely by other writers, guidance in the elementary schools is now emphasizing the following goals:

1. To enhance and make more functional our understanding of all children and to enhance and make more functional all children's understanding of themselves.
2. To help children with their goal-seeking, choice-making, and life planning...
3. To help children develop socially, to mature in their relations with others...
4. To help children begin early to grow in their understanding of the role of education in their lives and to help them mature in their life-planning.

Guidance services directed toward these developmental goals are listed by Dinkmeyer (1968, p. 45) as follows:

1. Pupil appraisal. Early identification of abilities, assets, talents, and liabilities, including both testing and non-testing methods.
2. Consulting. Help given to teachers in facilitating the learning of the child; and help for parents in understanding their children - includes sharing school information with them.
3. Counseling. This includes both remedial and developmental counseling with individuals and groups (Dinkmeyer, 1966).
4. Classroom guidance program. Includes identification of guidance needs and establishment of plans to serve these needs (Hill, 1965).
5. Group guidance and information services. Provision of materials for effective group guidance.
6. Administration, research and evaluation. Involves coordination of all aspects of the program.

The preceding has dealt primarily with the "should be's" of guidance, but little has been advanced as to the existing situation. Hill (1967) recently spent four months visiting elementary schools

across the United States which were having or establishing guidance programs. He found:

1. Substantial agreement that a need for better guidance for children in elementary schools exists.
2. Agreement regarding the purposes of a guidance program (in spite of early post-Sputnik era academic pressures) need to help human beings grow up. We are not simply training minds.
3. Essential elements in an effective guidance program are: shift in emphasis from the child as an object of study to the child in the role of partner in self-study. Counseling services for individuals and small groups, and coordination of the various special services.
4. Need for better coordination and management of pupil services.
5. Most commonly the elementary school guidance worker is called "school counselor" with services following the pattern of counseling-consultation-coordination. "There is variety in the role and function of the worker but in many cases this variety represents "sensible adaptation to the needs of a particular school."
6. Means for spreading findings of experiences in research are developing.
7. There are many problems and unsolved issues, i.e., counselor education; shortage of personnel, lack of coordination between secondary and elementary schools; "The unwarranted harping, in too much of what is being said and written about this field, upon the sins of diversity and of uncertainty;" continuing emphasis on the "problem child (Hill, 1967)."

Two of Hill's findings seem notable. Though schools may agree in theory about developmental guidance, they continue to practice in a problem-centered manner. Secondly, conflict in role and function of guidance personnel may not be as serious a problem as purported.

III. ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF GUIDANCE PERSONNEL

The sixties is a specialist age as well as a space age. The classroom teacher no longer must assume total responsibility for all aspects of the educational program. As the popularly labeled knowledge explosion continues and the business of education becomes more complex, educational functions are divided into increasingly smaller divisions. This parallels society's demand for more specialists. Teachers expect and receive help from experts in nearly every curriculum area, including guidance. This faith in experts, along with factors mentioned in Chapter II has led to the acceptance of specialists such as the counselor, psychologist and social worker in the schools. Expanded use of specialists has at the same time created organizational and administrative problems, particularly in the area of role and function clarification. Most writers, unlike Hill (1967) who was discussed previously, feel that roles must be clarified:

...A deep responsibility lies with the profession and with school counselors themselves to clarify perceptions of professional functions and services for which counselors properly qualify (Dugan, in Roeber, 1963, p.vii)

Dinkmeyer (1962, p.123) voices a similar concern:

There is a real need for a clear-cut definition of the role of the guidance specialist in the elementary school. At present, we find members of various professions working with varying levels of effectiveness in the elementary school guidance program.

Peters, Shertzer and VanHoose (1965, p.211) explain why

delineation of functions is necessary:

Perhaps the most important characteristic common to all effective school guidance programs is that they are well organized; guidance is a planned operation with responsibilities and duties carefully described and assigned. The proper assignment of guidance duties insures that each staff member understands his role in the program. A clear definition of his role is not only necessary for each staff member, it is also important for effective staff relationships and cooperation.

They also emphasize that a guidance program's success depends largely on the clarity with which each staff member understands his role in the program. Watson (1964, p. 38) too stresses that allocating responsibility keeps the school guidance organization from becoming "fuzzy and frustrating." She says that "It should be made quite clear when the members are to work together and when they are to part company to perform tasks for which they are competently trained."

Staub (1962, p. 11) cites a possible reason why role concepts become confused and why there is a need to retain flexibility:

Anyone who works within education needs to have a role concept to function with purpose and integrity. Roles in education, however, because of some of its rather unique characteristics, are of necessity inter-related.

Staub continues to explain that perceptions of roles held by various persons become manifest in behavior. He suggests that the counselor needs an attitude of role flexibility to maximize his operational effectiveness. For example, if a counselor sees his role too narrowly and that which he wishes to do conflicts with the perceived needs of those with whom he works, there can be problems which could jeopardize

his effectiveness. Meeks (1967) shares the hope that the uniqueness of roles won't be so well defined that opportunity for creative development closes.

Aubrey (1967) sees role conflict as one of the three major problems facing elementary school counseling today. Two other areas--training and preparation; and lack of theory and research, also seem highly related to role designation.

Finally, the need to define roles and functions within a theoretical framework is stressed (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962; Hill, 1966; Faust, 1966). The ASCD yearbook writers stress the need to define roles and functions as we apply what we know about human learning: "The goals of guidance will only be achieved if roles and functions are directed toward specific aspects of our relationship to the child as a learner in an educational setting." Hill (1966, p. 74) states that:

Definition of the functions of the school counselor in an elementary school must..., be rooted in prior commitments to a broad developmental view of the function of special services for all children, for teachers, and for parents.

Roles and functions "must emerge out of the public's educational objectives and the professional's rationale for human behavior change (Faust, 1966, p. 4).

A discussion of counselor role and functions followed by a brief description of related teacher, principal, psychologist, and social worker roles in the elementary school is presented in the following section. Areas of role similarity and differences among these personnel

are discussed.

Counselor Roles

Writers in the elementary counseling field seem to agree that the consulting role is of major importance to the counselor, and most agree that counseling, then coordination, constitute the other important roles. More than 20 different titles for the elementary counselor have been found in the literature by the writer and one study (Stefflre, 1963) suggests that more than 50 designations exist. Most titles include the word counselor or consultant depending on emphasis and kinds of functions performed. Child development consultant is a term favored by Smith and Eckerson (1966) of the U.S. Office of Education, however school counselor is used most frequently (American School Counselors Association, 1964; Hill, 1967; Koeppe, 1966).

Consulting. A consulting role for the counselor is supported by Byrne (1967), Faust (1966), Hill (1963), Johnston (1966), Kaczowski (1967), Kowitz and Kowitz (1964), Patouillet (1957), Smith and Eckerson (1966), Wilson (1951), and Wrenn (1962). In studies by Oldridge (1964) and Smith and Eckerson (1966) school principals considered consultation the counselor's primary role.

Consulting, Kaczowsky (1967) suggests, is a blend of psychological and educational viewpoints. It implies a sharing of information in a learning situation with both the consultant and the consultee arriving at hypotheses together and working out plans for implementation

(Dinkmeyer, 1968). "The basic goal of consultation is to bring into the life space of a child a level of consistency of expectation and to arrive at agreements that further the understandings among the major guides in a child's life, namely, his parents and his teachers (Van Hoose, 1967, p. 241)."

Teachers are prime receivers of consultation time, with parents second. McKellar (1967) classifies those functions related to teachers as: (a) conducting individual teacher conferences related to pupil needs and characteristics; (b) interpreting pupil data and test results; and (c) dealing with questions of student management and behavior change. Functions such as helping teachers arrange referrals to other personnel or agencies should be added to this list (Hill, 1966; Ohlsen, 1966).

Parent related functions include: (a) liaison between home and school; (b) direct contact at request of teacher or principal; (c) arranging referrals to out of school agencies; (d) helping them in areas of child understanding and management; and (e) interpreting pupil data (McKellar, 1967).

Some authors differentiate between parent consultations at school and those carried out in homes. Nearly all writers see a need for parent conferences or consultations at school (Dinkmeyer, 1968; Hill, 1966), but many oppose home visits (Peters et al., 1967). Kowitz and Kowitz (1964), Luckey (1968), and Mayer (1967) feel home visits should constitute a major portion of the counselor's time. Support for continued and increased work with parents came in a nation-wide study conducted by

Smith and Eckerson (1966). A stratified sample of over 5000 elementary school principals who received the services of a child development consultant (counselor, psychologist or social worker) chose parent consultation as the most important function that a "CDC" should do. Consultation with teachers, and counseling with children followed next.

The counselor will also consult with school administrators. Harrison (1963) suggests that such a meeting should involve a dual-interactive team approach. The counselor should also help principals and teachers to examine the consequences of instructional procedures on children (Faust, 1966; Kaczkowski, 1967).

Counseling. Counseling as a priority role is urged by the American School Counselor's Association (1964), Mayer (1967), Meeks (1963), and Peters, et al. (1964), though all these writers mention consulting as a primary secondary role. Interestingly, research studies indicate that few guidance workers at the elementary level actually spend much more than half of their school day in counseling relationships (McCreary and Miller, 1966) though they consider it their most important function. Principals studied by McCreary and Miller (1963) and McDougall and Reitan (1963); and teachers in Hart's (1961) survey, also agreed counseling was the counselor's most important job.

Cottingham (1966) points out that the counseling service in the elementary school today is not clearly identified with one professional person. The social worker or school psychologist may share this function, though most often the counselor has major responsibility. Counseling

should be done primarily with students experiencing problems normal for school age children (Dinkmeyer, 1968; Faust, 1968; Ohlsen, 1966; Peters et al., 1965). Counseling with teachers is usually limited to areas involving an individual child or groups of children (Peters et al., 1965). Similarly, parent counseling is limited to dealing with problems related to children's school concerns (Ohlsen, 1966). Generally writers agree that counseling of parents and teachers with personal problems even if their relationships with children are affected, should be referred to outside agencies. Likewise, long-term counseling of children with severe emotional problems should be referred to other sources (Dinkmeyer, 1968; Peters et al., 1965).

Counseling with children always has the goal of making children more effective learners (Dinkmeyer, 1968; Faust, 1966; Meeks, 1967) through better self understanding and improved relations with others (Koeppel, 1966; Poling, 1967). To meet this goal Cottingham (1968, p. 67) suggests that the counselor should decide where his emphasis should be between assessment and treatment procedures and where he should focus relative to pupil's affective and cognitive concerns. This question should also include the counselor's relationship to the classroom teacher (Faust, 1968).

A growing area in counseling at all school levels is counseling children in small groups who are experiencing problems in areas such as peer or sibling rivalry; interpersonal relationships; or attitudinal-emotional conflicts (Peters, et al., 1965). Group counseling is distinguished from group guidance by its content, procedures and the role

assumed by the leader (Goldman, 1962).

Coordination. The counselor because he is on the school staff and works closely with other pupil personnel specialists is seen by Peters (1965), Van Hoose, et al. (1967), Wrenn (1964), DeVries (1964), Hill (1966), Smith (1967), and others as best suited for the coordinator - leadership role within the school and with community agencies. In this role the counselor makes referrals for the school to community agencies and coordinates use of community services. "Through emphasis on the broad coordinative function, the dynamic elementary counselor will insure that the guidance program fulfills the crucial responsibilities given to it, i.e., facilitation of optimum development of all youth (Leonard, 1967, p. 89)."

Coordination as a role third in importance to counseling and consulting is mentioned by most writers, though emphasis varies. Often the principal coordinates school guidance activities himself while the counselor assumes a lesser responsibility (DeVries, 1964). However, McDougall and Reitan (1963) report that 84% of 169 principals surveyed in Washington, Idaho and Oregon felt that liaison with community agencies was an important counselor function. Similarly, teachers in Hart's (1961) study ranked the counselor's function of liaison between school and community agencies seventh on a list of 36, indicating that it was fairly important. Contrastingly, only about one-fourth of the elementary counselors surveyed by Wrenn (1962) saw referrals and contact with community agencies as an important function to be continued in the

future.

Combination role. Those supporting a combination counseling-consulting role include Cottingham (1966), Dinkmeyer (1968), and Koeppe (1967). A specialist in human relations role, possibly also a combination approach, is proposed by Poling (1967).

Faust's (1967) suggestion may end the argument. He urges that each school employ both a counselor and a consultant with each person serving two schools.

Highly related to the counselor versus consultant polemics is the question: "Should the counselor serve as a mental health generalist (professional prepared to provide services to all pupils), or be a specialist (prepared to provide services to only a few pupils) (Koeppe, 1966)? Koeppe (1966) believes that the majority of programs today are remedial-preventive in nature geared to help only those pupils with severe problems, an approach often supported by school administrators (DeVries, 1964).

A slightly different role concept of the elementary school counselor is found in the developmentalist who in many ways resembles the mental health generalist.

Developmentalist role. The developmentalist, or new elementary school counselor who is described by Faust (1968), was briefly introduced in Chapter II. "He is oriented largely to the developing requirements of the learning organism--the child." Practice of the developmental approach is believed to help teachers view children more positively

and in a broader frame of reference than the traditional problem versus non-problem dichotomy. The counselor's major emphasis is in developing learning climates for all children rather than for special or deviant children. While occasional child-crisis counseling is necessary, developmental counseling and consultation of teachers receive a major focus. "His developmental approach permits him to be aware of more facets of his role potential; therefore he does not narrowly and rigidly close out any substantial area of focus and function." Faust sees the counselor as providing personal counseling, both crisis and developmental to teachers as individuals and in groups to help them achieve better relationships with the children they teach. This type of contact is initiated by the teacher. Another area Faust sees as becoming increasingly important to the developmentalist is working with children in groups and through teachers rather than with individual children. Because the classroom climate is the counselor's primary focus, his time is not invested a great deal with parents. Faust (1968, p. 6) sees the counselor's role as dynamic and changeable: "The developmental counselor is not preoccupied with being a counselor. Rather his major focus is on children, on the child in the educative process. The counselor asks not 'What should my role be as a counselor?' Instead he says, 'What children are like will determine my behavior'."

Specifically what is the relative emphasis of the developmentalist on counseling and consulting functions with the various groups of children and adults he meets? This is described briefly in the

following section.

Counselor functions. According to Faust (1968) the developmentalist places almost no emphasis on educational program planning, scheduling and advisement; school choice and planning; testing programs; and principal or parent counseling. He places very little emphasis on psychologist's roles and functions such as individual diagnosis and testing; social worker's roles and functions such as working with families; and on parent consultation. Some emphasis is given to child-crisis counseling; child consultation; and referral agencies. Considerable emphasis is given to teacher-crisis counseling; teacher developmental counseling; teacher consultation; and in-service training for teachers. The counselor's involvement in career or occupational exploration is limited to coordinating teacher and secondary school counselor efforts in introducing career exploration into the curriculum.

Faust's ideas of the functions of developmentalist counselor do not coincide with other authors. Areas frequently mentioned in addition to counseling and consulting include vocational and occupation information; pupil appraisal and diagnosis; testing of individuals and groups; pupil placement; office-clerical tasks; research and evaluation; in-service training and curriculum consultation. Functions mentioned by writers as not belonging to the counselor are discipline, teaching, and supervision duties (Cottingham, 1963; Gannon and Peterson, 1963), remedial teaching, records clerk, and assistant to the principal (Dinkmeyer, 1968; McDougall and Reitan, 1963). Several factors may operate in

determining a school's guidance functions: (1) attitude and philosophy of the administrative staff; (2) extent and availability of community resources; (3) type of neighborhood and home environment school is located in; and (5) qualification of guidance personnel (Smith and Eckerson, 1966).

Vocational guidance. Traditionally, providing vocational guidance and occupational information constituted a major counselor function. Many counselor educators today stress the continuing need for these services while practitioners and school staffs often reject them.

1. Support for vocational guidance. The need for occupational information in the early grades to develop wholesome attitudes toward all fields of work and to make children aware of the wide variety of occupations, is stressed by Norris, Zeran and Hatch, (1960). Lifton (1964) points out that counselors can help children develop positive attitudes toward work through helping them to accept their own parent's occupations. Hill (1963) believes that this orientation to the role of work is best achieved through systematic instruction, individual study, and exploratory experiences. He says the counselor should help teachers to develop units and find materials which help to establish a developmental sequence of information. Arbuckle (1964) however, suggests that occupational information like any other information is useful only as a vehicle and a means for exploration. He states that what is important is the process and the involvement of the individual.

Probably most writers see the elementary counselor as sharing

the vocational orientation responsibility with the classroom teacher (Kaback, 1965; Peters, et al., 1965) by acting as an occupational consultant to the teacher rather than working directly with students (Wellington, 1966).

The counselor's functioning in this area is needed to provide realistic social and vocational orientation particularly for students who terminate their formal education at the elementary level (Wrenn, 1962).

2. Opposition to vocational guidance. Only one-fourth of northwestern principals surveyed by McDougall and Reitan (1963) felt that vocational guidance and providing occupational information were important counselor functions. Munro and Oelke's (1964) study of Georgia teachers and principals showed that the only guidance service that they did not want was a vocational and occupational information one. Significant too is Wrenn's (1962) study of a sample of elementary counselors belonging to the American School Counselor's Association. Not one counselor felt that vocational guidance and collection and dissemination of occupational information should be continued in the future by elementary school counselors.

Grant (1954) provides a rationale for discontinuance of this function when he emphasizes that vocational choice is not a problem of elementary school children and that it should not be a basis for guidance at that level. Smith and Eckerson (1962) and Gannon and Peterson (1963) also definitely oppose the counselor having a vocational guidance function. Meek's (1967, p. 185) suggestion that perhaps the school's

greatest role should be in "protecting the elementary pupil from the pressures of too early career choice," tends to support opposition to the counselor's traditional vocational guidance functions.

Testing and diagnosis. Over the past four decades, the counselor has carried out individual testing and diagnostic functions as well as group testing activities. Today the counselor's role in the area of testing and appraisal techniques is primarily that of interpretation and utilization rather than administration (Meeks, 1967). Interpretation of tests to teachers, principals (Johnston, 1966; Smith and Eckerson, 1966), parents (Koeppel, 1966), and increasingly to students themselves (Dinkmeyer, 1968), is seen as important by several writers.

Dinkmeyer (1968) and others agree that although the counselor performs some testing duties he cannot function as a psychometrician and fulfill the broad objectives of elementary guidance.

Hart (1961) studied the views of teachers in 38 school districts and found a lessening of demands for testing by counselors. They placed the testing by the counselor 12.5 on a list of 35 indicating that it wasn't too important.

1. Perceived need for testing function. Most counselor studies indicate a need for counselor testing activities. DeVries (1964) an administrator, strongly emphasizes the importance of the counselor's role in diagnosing students and administering tests. McDougall and Reitan (1963) found that 83% of principals surveyed felt that it was very important for the counselor to assist teachers in testing and

appraisal techniques. Nearly half thought that interpreting student test data and planning the testing program were also very important functions. This agrees with findings in McCreary and Miller's (1966) California study. The testing program was seen by teachers and administrators as fourth in importance to counseling and consultation of teachers and parents. Over 65% of the teachers in the study had received individual testing services from the counselor and the second most frequent service that 49% received was child counseling. In Boney and Glofka's study (1967) of counselor educator's and teacher's perceptions in Illinois, teachers favored a diagnostician role for the counselor. Raine's (1964) doctoral study reported that 31 Ohio counselors interviewed spent a large part of their time carrying out testing and diagnostic functions. Similarly diagnostic work with children presenting problems was ranked fourth in value importance of 71 guidance functions by 992 Indian teachers (Brown and Pruett, 1967). Teachers also gave a high rating to counselors in administering group intelligence and achievement tests.

Research. Research and guidance program evaluation functions have become increasingly important to many counselor educators (Hill, 1966; Johnston, 1966; Peters, 1965; Van Hoose, et al., 1967). Peters and Hansen (1964) stress that research in pupil development in educational settings is one of the most promising frontiers today. Many school principals agree. In one study (McDougall and Reitan, 1963) 59% of the principals felt that conducting community guidance research was an important counselor function.

Though counselors do carry out research, many do not feel they should. Smith and Eckerson (1963) in a survey of 24 school guidance programs in ten states found that counselors conducted research and evaluative studies of guidance activities. However, only three percent of 138 counselors in Wrenn's (1962) study thought this function had future importance for them.

Other functions. There are numerous minor tasks performed by counselors which are discussed by various writers, but neither agreement nor heated debate surround them. Occasionally mentioned functions include such tasks as: collecting and organizing data (Meeks, 1967); identifying students with special talents (Gannon and Peterson, 1963; Cottingham, 1963; Smith and Eckerson, 1966); identifying students with learning problems (Smith and Eckerson, 1963); conducting group guidance sessions to dispense various types of information (Peters et al., 1965; Dinkmeyer, 1968); keeping student records and files; reporting guidance accomplishments annually to the principal; ordering tests and guidance materials; conducting case conferences (Hart, 1961); helping needy children to obtain glasses, clothes, food and other necessities (Smith and Eckerson, 1963); reading diagnosis (Wrenn, 1962); scheduling special classes and placing students in them (Koeppe, 1966; Hart, 1961); reporting pupil data to community agencies (Hart, 1961); helping organize study body activities (McCreary and Miller, 1963); orienting pupils to the next grade or school (Bosdell, 1961; McDougall and Reitan, 1963); orienting new pupils to school (Nitzschte and Sorohram, 1967); helping

teachers design and interpret sociograms (Brown and Pruett, 1967); assisting children to develop study skills (Peters, et al. 1965); participating in parent-teacher conferences (McCreary and Miller, 1963); parent education (Dinkmeyer, 1968); interpreting the guidance program to the community, and public relations (Peters, 1965); and assisting in promotion and retention decisions (Brown and Pruett, 1967). Serving as a consultant in family life or sex education is a guidance function which the North American public appears to be demanding (Edmonton Journal, 1968), but is one which the writer could find no mention of in counseling literature or research studies.

Trends. Recently, two major trends in counselor functions have emerged. These are (1) involvement in curriculum development and (2) in-service training of teachers. Counselor responsibilities in these areas have undoubtedly come about with the increasing acceptance of developmental guidance philosophy, Faust (1968). The rationale for performing them seems to be that teacher skills and curriculum content are major factors in determining classroom learning climates. If the counselor is to work toward creating optimum learning environments for all children he will necessarily be involved in assisting teachers to better their skills. He will also serve as a member of the curriculum committee where he will advise members on children's developmental needs (ACES-ASCA Committee, 1965; Dinkmeyer, 1968; Faust, 1966, 1968; Hill, 1966; Kaczkowski, 1968).

1. Curriculum development. Many writers see the curriculum as the

obvious means of integrating guidance and instruction: "...elementary school guidance should work toward preventing certain needless waste of a child's life by providing a curriculum design which envisions guidance as being compatible with instruction (Schuster and Ploghoft, 1963, p. 176). However, some evidence suggests that counselors themselves do not see curriculum development as part of their responsibilities. Only six percent of the counselors in Wrenn's (1962) study saw this function as one to be maintained in the future. And there is only a slight trend for teachers to see the possibility of counselor involvement in curriculum. About one-fifth of Indiana (Brown and Pruett, 1967) teachers gave the counselor a major responsibility for making "recommendations for curriculum changes." Half gave the job to themselves and one-fourth gave it to the principal.

2. In-service training. Dinkmeyer (1968) sees in-service training as a way to fill gaps in teacher education; to help teachers develop techniques to function more effectively in parent interviews; and to help improve their diagnostic skills. Others believe in-service work should assist teachers and administrators in the areas of learning, child development, and psychological services (Bernard et al., 1954; Harrison, 1966; Hill, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Poling, 1967; Smith and Eckerson, 1966).

Teachers in one study (Brown and Pruett, 1967) gave counselors the in-service education responsibility in the areas of testing, pupil appraisal techniques and case conferences. These recommendations seem to agree with Smith and Eckerson's (1963) finding that counselors do

participate in in-service training in areas involving student study habits, mental health, testing, guidance techniques, and occupational information. However, teachers surveyed in some studies don't see themselves as needing in-service training (Hart, 1961).

Teacher. Opinions and studies in the literature unanimously agree that the teacher has the central role in the elementary school guidance program. All resource personnel direct their efforts toward enhancing and making more effective teachers. They have the most contact with children and are in the best position to influence their development. The teacher's major responsibility is to establish a warm and healthy classroom environment in which learning readily takes place (Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Watson, 1964). She does the original diagnostic work in screening children and selecting those in need of referral (Brown and Pruett, 1967; Dinkmeyer, 1968; Peters, et al., 1965; Watson, 1964). The teacher also carries out group guidance activities involving social, personal, educational, and vocational information (Dinkmeyer, 1967; Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Smallenburg, 1964). Parent conferences, though shared with other personnel are also a primary teacher function (Brown and Pruett, 1967; Dinkmeyer, 1968; Koeppe, 1966). All writers include the teacher in curriculum development. Other teacher functions may include collecting and reporting pupil information (Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965) administering group achievement tests and interpreting results to parents (Bosdell, 1961; Brown and Pruett, 1967); and encouraging classroom discussions

related to children's concerns (Bosdell, 1961; Watson, 1964). Teachers also share orientation functions with the counselor (Peters et al., 1965). Functions rarely if ever mentioned as belonging to the teacher are home visits; providing individual counseling or therapy; administering individual intelligence tests; or contacting community referral agencies.

Principal. Generally the principal gives leadership to the guidance program by providing the means for other personnel to carry out their functions (Brown and Pruett, 1967; Dinkmeyer, 1968). He promotes or plans in-service education programs, though he usually doesn't conduct the sessions (Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965). The principal also interprets school services to parents and community (Bosdell, 1961; DeVries, 1964); and he usually participates in curriculum development (DeVries, 1964; Koeppe, 1966). Functions mentioned by a few writers include counseling teachers if a counselor isn't available (Koeppe, 1966; Bosdell, 1961); calling case conferences (SRA, 1960); assigning students to special classes (DeVries, 1964); creating a good building atmosphere (DeVries, 1964; Koeppe, 1966); and disciplining pupils who are habitual offenders (Bosdell, 1961).

Other personnel. Other important school guidance personnel in addition to the social worker and psychologist who will be discussed later, are the school nurse, remedial reading specialist, librarian, speech and hearing therapist, curriculum consultant, psychometrist, and clerical staff, or teacher aids. Generally these roles are characterized by a lack of conflict, confusion, or overlapping. For this

reason they are generally not included in research studies or discussions of guidance personnel. However, they provide valuable help and referral sources for the teacher, administrator, social worker, counselor, and psychologist.

The nurse is responsible for the health needs of children. She usually has a liaison role with other community agencies, and may make home visits (Peters et al., 1965). Her concerns closely parallel those of the social worker.

The reading specialist has responsibilities for diagnosing reading problems and providing remediation. She is also a consultant to teachers (Koeppel, 1966).

Diagnosing and carrying out corrective procedures for speech and hearing disorders is the major function of the speech and hearing therapist.

The librarian and curriculum consultant roles are inherent in their titles. They both deal with resource materials.

Testing individuals constitutes the major roles of the psychometrist who is usually trained as a psychologist, but with less extensive graduate training.

The school clerk, secretary or teacher aid will increasingly record test results in school records; keep cumulative folder information up-to-date; score tests; and administer a few group tests (Bosdell, 1961).

Differentiation Between Counselor, Social Worker and Psychologist Roles

The American Personnel and Guidance Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Association of Social Workers have among their members persons professionally educated to work in schools. All these organizations are recommending their services for the elementary schools. Consequently, elementary school counselor functions are often confused with or overlapped with those of the school social worker and school psychologist. One question which often arises is "Where does the responsibility of the school psychologist end, and that of the counselor begin (Science Research Associates, 1960) and at what point does the social worker enter?" Some trends are evident, however many questions remain unanswered in the literature and available research.

School social worker. Spence, a social worker (1954) says the social worker does casework which helps teachers help individual children in their classrooms; develops closer parent - school relationships; provides the school with information about the child; works on modification of children, parents and teachers attitudes; and helps emotionally disturbed children. Counselor educators and teachers also generally see the primary social worker's functions as related to casework, parent work, and home conditions (Bosdell, 1961; Brown and Pruett, 1967; Connecticut State Department of Education, 1955; Dinkmeyer, 1968). Liaison and coordination between home, school and community agencies is

another major responsibility (Connecticut State Department of Education, 1955; Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Smith and Eckerson, 1966). The social worker also counsels parents and children (Dinkmeyer, 1968), and is increasingly concerned with prevention, and work with normal children (Pearman and Burrows, 1955). Many writers see the social worker as retaining this traditional involvement in truancy and attendance problems (Bosdell, 1961; Brown and Pruett, 1967; DeVries, 1964; Science Research Associates, 1960). Social work functions likely to overlap those of the counselor are primarily counseling and parent involvement. The social worker and psychologist or counselor may overlap in working with emotionally disturbed children.

School psychologist. The psychologist's role probably is as varied as the counselor's. In some school systems the psychologist is concerned mainly with testing; in others he is charged with promoting good human relations and mental hygiene in schools; in others he functions almost as a counselor (SRA, 1960).

The American Psychological Association maintains that the school psychologist serves an advisory capacity to the school; measures and interprets intelligence and social and emotional development of children; and identified exceptional children and helps plan for them. Writers generally concur with this job description (Bosdell, 1961; Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Smallenburg, 1964; Van Hoose et al., 1967). The psychologist is also seen as contributing to in-service training (Brown and Pruett, 1967) through case conferences (Smith and Eckerson, 1966).

He may make referrals to outside school agencies (Bosdell, 1961) promote and engage in research (Peters et al., 1965; Smullenburg, 1964); work with parents (Bosdell, 1961; Peters et al., 1965); and diagnose educational and personal disabilities (Bosdell, 1961; Koeppe, 1966; Peters et al., 1965; Van Hoose, 1967). There is a growing trend for the psychologist and counselor to share counseling and guidance functions (Bosdell, 1961; Peters et al., 1965). However, the psychologist usually is concerned more with exceptional children, including children with severe emotional problems than is the counselor (Cutts, 1955; Conn. State Dept. of Educ., 1955). The counselor most often overlaps the psychologist's function by giving individual intelligence tests and diagnosing children with problems.

Similarities and differences in roles. Eckerson and Smith (1962, p. 115) describe a booklet by the Connecticut State Department of Education (1955) which lists common aspects of guidance consultant, school social worker and school psychologist functions:

1. Each tries to help pupils to utilize their abilities more fully. Each works with a child individually and may seek special help from others.
2. Each renders service in cooperation with the school staff.
3. Each develops and maintains information and records about pupils.
4. Each has a real interest in research.
5. Each of the three professions shares a responsibility for working with parents.

Another area they share is consulting with the teacher in regard to individual children. Many writers believe that the functions of these three specialists not only do, but should overlap each other (Eckerson, 1967) and the differences are in degree of intensity rather than in kind (Boney and Glofka, 1967; McCreary and Miller, 1966). The increasing similarities in these three roles have led several guidance experts to advocate consolidation of the three roles into one called "child development consultant" (Patouillet, 1967; Smith and Eckerson, 1966), or "school counseling psychologist" (Arbuckle, 1967). This they say, would reduce overlap in functions, and interprofessional rivalry, and consolidate services. Arbuckle (1967) suggests that all three professionals should have enough knowledge to give an accurate diagnosis and prognosis of children; do some counseling; and be key people in curriculum development. "The optimum growth of youngsters seems to dictate a merging of the three orientations within an educational framework (Eckerson, 1967, p. 353)."

Arbuckle's (1967) and Eckerson's (1967) ecumenical solution to overlap in specialist's functions appears unnecessary in view of Faust's (1968) proposed developmentalist counselor role. The counselor would greatly utilize referral sources. Social workers and psychologists trained in counseling, casework, and diagnosis and testing with individual children and parents would be necessary. This would assist the counselor in her most effective role--as consultant to teachers in an effort to improve children's learning environment.

CHAPTER IV

NEED FOR THE STUDY AND INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

I. NEED FOR THE STUDY

The problem of conflict and confusion in elementary school guidance personnel roles and functions was presented in Chapter III. Proposal of a developmentalist role for the counselor offers a possible solution as no other profession has been or is involved in this needed role as described in this study. However, little research exists which describes future counselor role and functions as perceived by guidance personnel groups in relation to their own function constellations. There is a need to look at these relationships and sort out areas of congruence and discord as they compare to the proposed role. Common ground must be sought to build the new developmentalist role and then areas of disagreement narrowed for future study. A capsule summary of recent research of guidance roles and functions shows that this need has not yet been fulfilled.

Related Studies of Counselor Role and Functions

About 20 studies on elementary school guidance personnel roles and functions have been published in the past decade. This sparse research appears to lack cohesion (Cottingham, 1967). Apparently little attempt has been made by researchers to replicate each other's work by using expanded personnel groups or different geographical areas.

Shertzer and Lundy (1964), and McDougall and Reitan (1963) examined the image of the counselor as perceived by school administrators. Foster, (1965) in Kentucky, studied the future elementary counselor's role and function as perceived by counselor educators, state supervisors, principals and counselors. Bosdell (1960) looked at role perceptions of teachers, counselors, principals and school psychologists toward each other in Illinois, while Gatchel (1958) obtained in his study teachers' reactions to specific guidance services. Muro (1965) explored Georgia teachers and principals perceptions of the elementary guidance specialist, and McCreary and Miller (1966) studied California principals, teachers and counselor's perceptions of counselor functions. Two counselor roles, consultant and psychotherapeutic, were compared through experimental and control groups by Oldridge (1964). Hart (1961) questioned teachers, principals, counselors and superintendents in 34 California school districts on counselor functions. The rate of frequency with which various guidance functions were performed was investigated by McKellar (1963). Raines (1964), and Nitzschke and Hill (1964), examined the functions that are or should be provided by elementary counseling personnel. Indiana teachers were asked by Brown and Pruett (1967) whether they, the principal, or counselor or others should assume responsibility for various guidance functions. Counselor educators' perceptions of the counselor's role was studied by Boney and Glofka (1967) and Nitzschke and Sorohan (1967). Wrenn (1962) looked at how counselors regard their present and future counselor functions.

Smith and Eckerson conducted two major studies. They surveyed 24 guidance programs in ten states (1963), describing typical counselor functions, and later (1966) studied a random sample of 5,504 school principals' opinions of the most important functions of the child development consultant.

Purpose of the Present Study

Findings from previous studies are difficult to compare because of widely differing personnel groups, group sizes, number and types of questionnaire items, modes of response, and methods of evaluation. However, several gaps which need researching seem apparent. (1) No study apparently included the following functionaries: social workers, pupil personnel administrators, and remedial specialists. (2) Only one study (Brown and Pruett, 1967) offered respondents an opportunity to assign minor responsibilities for guidance functions. (3) No researchers attempted to relate their findings to the emerging developmentalist role (see Chapter II, III). This study is an attempt to answer these three needs in another geographical setting--Edmonton, Alberta, where formal elementary school guidance programs are just developing.

Roles and functions of various guidance personnel groups as perceived by teachers, principals, remedial specialists, social workers, psychologists, counselors, and pupil personnel administrators will be looked at in three ways: (1) the way guidance personnel perceive roles and functions of themselves and each other; (2) how the combined personnel group perceives each role as performing certain functions; and (3) how each personnel group compares with all other groups in looking at each

of the roles.

Study Suppositions

To facilitate discussion of results seven study suppositions or tentative predictions were stated:

1. Members within the total responding pupil personnel and school staff group will disagree on the role and function of the elementary school counselor; no questionnaire items will be assigned to the counselor as a major responsibility by more than 75% of the total group.
2. Individual school staff and pupil personnel staff members will ascribe the counselor "counseling" functions primarily to the counselor.
3. Functions such as curriculum development and in-service training of teachers which characterize a developmentalist role will be assigned to personnel other than the counselor.
4. Counselors will disagree with each other on their role and responsibilities related to functions traditionally carried out by school psychologists and school social workers as measured by item responses on the questionnaire.
5. One aspect of the need for elementary school counselors in the school district studied will be shown by the weight of responsibility for functions assigned the elementary counselor.
6. Elementary school teachers and administrators perceive the roles of the counselor, psychologist and social worker, similarly; the

correlation between their perceptions of the three roles will be high.

7. Pupil personnel administrators, remedial specialists and social workers will perceive the role of the psychologist and role of the social worker more similarly than they perceive the role of the counselor; the correlations between these three groups will be higher for the psychologist role and social worker role, than for the counselor role.

II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The population. The total group of seven elementary school counselors who serve 19 Edmonton public schools were selected to serve as a nucleus for the study. All major special personnel assigned these schools as well as principals and a 20.8 percent sample of teachers were asked to participate. One hospital school for exceptional children was omitted from the study so that a total of 18 schools were used. The total special personnel assigned to these schools in addition to the seven counselors and 18 administrators included 5 remedial specialists, 3 social workers, and 5 psychologists. The 4 administrators of pupil personnel services were also included. A sample of 51 teachers was drawn from a population of 245. These were taken from an alphabetical list of each school's staff. Two each were selected at random from schools having 9, 10, or 11 teachers; three from schools with 12 to 16 teachers; and four from schools with 17 or 18 teachers. The composite school staff and special personnel group totaled 93 subjects. Individual letters to the teachers and administrators were delivered to each school, and letters to special personnel were delivered personally (Appendix B). All questionnaires were returned.

The instrument. A questionnaire "Whose Job Is It?" containing 63 guidance functions drawn from the literature was created (Appendix A). Columns representing six major pupil personnel roles--teacher, school administrator, remedial specialist, school social worker, school

psychologist and school counselor were included on the instrument opposite each function item. Directions provided that an ordinal ranking be used. A "3" representing major responsibility was to be assigned to one of the six roles opposite each item. A "2" representing minor responsibility and a "1" signifying "should be involved" could also be assigned to all or none of the other role columns on each item. Instructions emphasized that respondents were to respond with the future "should", that is the part of the school staff who should have responsibility.

Data Analysis

Several methods were used to analyze questionnaire data. Pearson Product-moment correlations using mean scores over each questionnaire item were calculated for each pupil personnel group. The resulting 36 by 42 intercorrelation matrix then provided a method of comparing each set of two personnel groups' perceptions of the remaining roles. Because all groups except the teachers represented total populations, tests of significance based on sampling were not appropriate. An arbitrary cut off point of .70 was used as an informal means of determining extent of agreement between two scores. Correlations over .70 were understood to mean substantial agreement.

Perceived major and minor responsibilities of the six roles for the 63 functions were also calculated. Total 3's (major responsibilities) and 2's (minor responsibilities) from the total combined personnel group (n=86) excluding the counselors, were counted on the IBM data card

sorting machine. Total 3's and 2's were then converted into percentages by hand for assignment of roles responsible for each function. Later, one fourth of the items (15) which were selected by a majority of the total group as being the counselor's responsibility and ones which best represented developmentalist guidance functions were analyzed further. Three's assigned by each of the responding seven personnel groups to each role for each of the 15 items were sorted by hand and converted into percentages. This provided a means of comparing how each individual group saw each other's roles.

In addition, a brief sub-study was carried out to locate function items which involved a counseling relationship. Agreements provided a rationale for using the term "counseling relationship." Two counselor educators and three experienced post-master's degree counselors sorted the 63 questionnaire items on cards into groups designated "counseling relationship" and "non-counseling relationship." Items on which at least four of the five counselors agreed were then considered counseling functions.

Limitations. A major limitation of the study was the small number of members in each school personnel group other than teachers and principals. It would have been possible to determine differences in perception within individual groups if larger groups were available.

An additional column should have been included on the questionnaire for clerical help as non-professionals are increasingly being

given record keeping and group testing responsibilities.

A few respondents indicated that some questionnaire items were too vague, and answering was difficult.

Pilot Study

To establish questionnaire reliability, ten graduate students in educational psychology participated in a separate pilot study. The questionnaire was administered to the group in November and four and a half months later, in March. The Pearson Product-moment method was used to determine reliability. Results were:

<u>ROLES</u>					
<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Admin.</u>	<u>Rem. Spec.</u>	<u>Soc. Wkr.</u>	<u>Psych.</u>	<u>Couns.</u>
.8311	.7184	.7615	.8772	.6707	.7725

These pilot study results tend to support the reliability of the questionnaire items. Assignment of responsibility to the psychologist was least reliable. The stability in perception of the social worker's role probably resulted from the extremely small number of functions assigned to that role. It is probable that perception's of the teacher's role are most stable because of universal and long association with teachers.

CHAPTER V

THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

I. ASSIGNMENT OF ROLE RESPONSIBILITY

Classification of Functions

The 63 questionnaire items were grouped into 12 function areas. This provided a convenient means of summarizing roles that were perceived as having major responsibilities within these areas. Table I shows the wide range of roles assigned. No one role was perceived as having total responsibility for any function area, however, some clusterings are evident. Individual diagnosis was divided among the counselor, psychologist and remedial specialist. Curriculum and instruction tasks were assigned primarily to the teacher. Discipline was also seen as a teacher or administrative function. Clerical type duties were perceived as shared by the teacher, administrator and counselor. Two non-testing evaluation tasks were assigned the teacher; the other two were given the administrator and psychologist. The counselor was assigned half of the guidance and counseling functions, while the teacher was perceived as sharing most others. Two of three in-service training tasks were seen as the psychologist's, and the social worker was named for two of three liaison responsibilities. Most disagreement was found among respondents on non-counseling home involvement functions. Four different roles were assigned responsibilities in this area, with the administrator and social worker given the most. It is interesting that the psychologist

TABLE I

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY INCLUDED ON ROLE-FUNCTION QUESTIONNAIRE
AND ROLES ASSIGNED TO THEM BY SUBJECT GROUP N=93

ITEMS IN CATEGORIES	CODE	FUNCTION AREAS	ROLE ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY BY MAJORITY OF SUBJECTS
10, 41, 52	A	Appraisal - diagnosis of individuals	^a counselor or psychologist - 10, 52; remedial specialist - 41
5, 6, 20, 22, 26, 27, 30, 32, 38	C	Curriculum - instruction	teacher - 5, 6, 22, 26, 38; teacher or administrator - 32; admin. - 27; counselor - 20; couns. or psych. - 30
4, 7, 11	D	Discipline	teacher - 11; teacher or admin. - 7; administrator - 4
15, 19, 29, 34	E	Evaluation, identification, placement	teacher - 15, 19; admin. - 34; psychologist - 29
18, 21, 23, 25, 28, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40	G	Guidance and counseling	counselor - 23, 28, 35, 37; couns. or teacher - 40; couns. or admin. - 18; teacher - 21, 31, 33; administrator - 25
45, 54, 62	I	In-service training	psychologist - 45, 54; counselor - 62
24, 36, 39	L	Liaison, referrals (coordination)	social worker - 36, 39; administrator or counselor - 24
3, 12, 9, 16	O	Office, clerical	teacher - 3, 9; counselor or administrator - 16; administrator, teacher and counselor - 12
2, 14, 17, 43, 47, 53, 55, 59, 61	P	Parent-home involvement (non-counseling)	counselor - 61; social worker - 53; teacher - 43; admin. - 55, 2, 47; social worker and couns. 59; soc. or admin. - 14, 17
48, 57, 60	R	Research	administrator - 57, 60; teacher - 48
1, 8, 13, 50	S	Student contact (non-counseling)	teacher - 1, 8, 13; administrator or counselor - 50
42, 44, 46, 49, 51, 56, 58, 63	T	Test - related	counselor - 51; couns. or teacher - 44; teacher - 56, 58 administrator - 42, 63; admin. or counselor - 46, 49

^aThe roles connected by "or" are those in which responding groups were split on their opinion as to who should have responsibility for the function.

wasn't seen as involved in this area, and the teacher was only slightly. Two of three research functions were also assigned the administrator. The teacher was perceived as having three of four non-teaching student responsibilities. Teachers, administrators and counselors were seen as sharing eight group test-related duties. In summary, responsibilities for function areas coded on Table I were: teacher C,E,O,S; administrator P,R; teacher and administrator D,T; social worker L; psychologist I; counselor G; and psychologist and counselor A.

Description of Tables

Tables II through VIII and X show the composite pupil personnel group's role perceptions of guidance functions. The group was composed of 59.3% teachers; 20.9% administrators; 5.8% remedial specialists; 5.8% psychologists; 4.7% pupil personnel administrators; and 3.5% social workers. The counselor's were excluded from percentage totals and dealt with separately in Tables VI, VII, VIII, X and XI. Hereafter the term "composite group" will refer to all personnel groups excluding counselors. Individual group role perceptions for selected items are shown later in Table XI. Each table in the first part of the chapter has a title showing the one role of six which had the highest percentage of major responsibilities assigned to it. Minor responsibility assignments are also included in the tables in the second row across from each function item. These total more or less than 100% because respondents could assign none, or more than one minor responsibility per item. Tables related to the teacher, administrator, remedial specialist and social worker are grouped together following description of them.

Teacher functions. Teacher functions perceived by a large majority of respondents, shown in Table II were: (1) help maintain healthy classroom environment; (2) provide students with study habit "hints;" (3) deal with student behavior problems; (4) supervise extra-curricular activities; (5) teach academic subjects; (6) be aware of individual student needs; (7) help gifted children develop their potential; and (8) give group achievement tests.

Functions perceived as the teacher's by a smaller majority of the composite group were: (1) keep school cumulative records up to date; (2) encourage student participation in city and school activities; (3) enter group test results in cumulative record files; (4) fail and accelerate students; (5) identify children with learning problems; (6) help students to evaluate their own abilities; (7) contact parents of children who aren't doing their homework; and (8) have class discussions on personality-behavior topics. Less than half the group gave the teacher responsibility for sex education instruction, and response assignments to other roles for this function were varied. Many respondents objected to this item as a school function. Ten percent of the total group of 93 left this blank.

About half the composite group assigned the counselor a minor responsibility in (1) identifying children with learning problems; (2) providing students with study habit "hints;" (3) helping students to evaluate their own abilities; (4) helping gifted children to develop their potential; and (5) having class discussions on personality-behavior topics. Nearly half the group thought the counselor should also

have a minor responsibility in decisions involving failing and accelerating students.

Considerable disagreement as to whether the teacher or some other functionary should have major responsibility for an item is evident in Table III. Teachers and administrators were both seen as responsible for curriculum development and teachers and counselors shared the function of giving group intelligence tests. Helping students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas was a function seen as the teacher's, counselor's and psychologist's.

Administrator functions. Table IV shows perceived administrator functions. The composite group substantially agree that the administrator should (1) deal with infractions of school rules; (2) evaluate teacher effectiveness in teaching; (3) orient parent groups; (4) substitute occasionally for teachers; and (5) carry out research dealing with one school. Less agreement was found regarding talking with teachers who have personal problems; and contacting parents of misbehaving children. Slightly less than one half the total group agreed that the administrator should discover reasons for student absenteeism and work on truancy problems. Interestingly, these functions have traditionally been assigned to social workers.

Nearly half the respondents thought counselors should have a minor responsibility for working on truancy problems and contacting parents of misbehaving children.

Functions sometimes associated with the administrative role

caused most disagreement among respondents. Ten functions, listed in Table V were perceived as belonging to the administrator by less than half the total group. Maintaining order in the halls was seen as both a teacher and an administrator responsibility. Summarizing group tests results was seen as a major responsibility of the administrator, counselor and psychologist, and two functions involving parent assistance were seen as the counselor's as well as administrator's. Research involving more than one school and evaluating school district tests were functions seen as belonging to the administrator and psychologist.

Remedial specialist and social worker functions. The remedial specialist was perceived by three-fourths of the composite group as being responsible for giving individual diagnostic reading tests. This is shown in Table VI.

Maintaining contacts with welfare agencies; and collecting information on home backgrounds, were seen as social worker tasks by most respondents. About half the composite group also assigned the social worker the tasks of (1) referring students to community agencies; (2) making home visits; and (3) making appropriate contacts in cases of serious student offences.

Nearly one-third the composite group perceived the counselor as having major responsibility for making home visits and collecting information on home backgrounds, and nearly half the group assigned minor responsibility for these two items to the counselor. Five of the seven counselors also felt that they should have major responsibility for these functions.

TABLE II

FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO TEACHERS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY TEACHERS;
SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS; SOCIAL WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS;
AND PUPIL PERSONNEL ADMIN. N=86

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
1. Orient new students to school.	^a 60.0 ^b 32.9	32.9 49.4	1.2 1.2	8.2	3.5	5.9 21.2	85
3. Keep school cumulative records up to date.	62.7 30.2	32.5 34.9	4.6	8.1	1.2 8.1	3.4 33.7	86
5. Help maintain "healthy" classroom environment.	98.8 1.2	1.2 66.3	2.3	3.5	4.6	30.2	86
6. Provide students with study habit "hints".	91.7 5.8	22.3	1.2 24.7	3.5	1.2 8.2	7.0 51.7	85
8. Encourage student parti- cipation in city and school activities.	62.0 31.6	31.6 48.1	1.2	2.5 16.4	5.1	3.7 37.9	79
9. Enter group test results in cumulative record files.	58.3 25.0	26.1 29.8	5.9	2.4	2.3 13.1	13.0 20.2	84
11. Deal with student behavior problems.	89.5 6.9	3.4 69.7	2.3	9.3	4.6 23.3	2.3 36.0	86
13. Supervise extra- curricular activities.	72.6 14.3	26.2 44.0		1.2 4.8	1.2	8.2	84

^aThe first row of figures after each item represents the percentage of major responsibilities assigned to the teaching staff by six groups of pupil personnel staff, excluding the counselor group.

^bThe second row of figures after each item represents the percentage of minor responsibilities assigned to all groups by all groups except counselors.

NOTE: Since there was no limit to the number of minor responsibilities assigned to each item, total percentages will vary in all second rows. All percentages are rounded off to the nearer tenth place.

TABLE II (continued)

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
15. Fail and accelerate students.	<u>69.0</u> 29.8	29.8 51.2	24.3	7.1	20.2	1.2 40.5	84
19. Identify children with learning problems.	<u>65.1</u> 26.7	1.2 30.2	17.4 47.7	11.6	12.8 39.5	3.5 60.5	86
21. Be aware of individual student needs.	<u>86.2</u> 9.2	3.4 45.9	2.3 34.5	1.2 22.9	1.2 39.1	5.7 56.3	87 ^a
22. Give instruction in sex education to students. ^b	<u>45.3</u> 22.6	4.0 17.3	1.3	17.3 13.3	12.0 24.0	20.0 37.3	75
26. Help "gifted" children to develop their potential.	<u>77.5</u> 14.1	5.9 50.6	4.7 18.8	7.1	2.4 30.6	9.4 48.2	85
31. Help students to evaluate their own abilities.	<u>60.7</u> 28.6	2.4 25.0	2.4 19.0	9.5	3.6 39.3	31.0 52.4	84
33. Have class discussions on personality-behavior topics.	<u>58.4</u> 19.0	1.2 27.4	2.4	3.6 19.0	10.7 29.8	26.2 47.6	84
38. Teach academic subjects.	<u>100.0</u>	22.3	12.9				85
43. Contact parents of children who aren't doing their homework.	<u>60.4</u> 25.6	29.1 37.2	1.2	2.3 13.9	5.8	8.1 31.4	86

^aThere are four items which had 87 responses because two teachers each assigned a "3" or major responsibility, twice in the same row on two items.

^b8.2 percent of the 93 persons who responded to the questionnaire left this item and the related item 30 blank or wrote a note to the effect that sex education was not the job of the school.

TABLE II (continued)

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
48. Carry out research in individual classrooms.	<u>50.0</u> 15.9	20.7 34.1	7.3 12.2	2.4 19.5	9.8 23.2	9.8 29.3	82
56. Summarize results of I.Q. and achievement tests for a classroom.	<u>52.4</u> 21.9	19.5 29.3	2.4 3.7	2.4	10.9 9.7	14.6 26.8	82
58. Give group achievement tests.	<u>72.1</u> 9.3	3.5 33.7	4.6	1.2	4.6 10.4	19.8 17.4	86

TABLE III

ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS)
SHOWED MOST DISAGREEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE TEACHING
STAFF OR SOME OTHER ROLE SHOULD HAVE MAJOR
RESPONSIBILITY

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N.
32. Develop the curriculum.	50.6 43.4	48.2 42.2	18.1	2.4	1.2 9.6	13.2	83
40. Help students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas.	45.8 32.9	31.8	5.9	42.4	22.4 48.2	31.2 56.5	85
44. Give group intelligence tests.	38.5 24.1	7.2 24.1	1.2 4.8	1.2 1.2	16.9 19.3	34.9 26.5	83

TABLE IV

FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO ADMIN. STAFF AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES
BY TEACHERS; SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS;
SOCIAL WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS; AND PUPIL
PERSONNEL ADMIN. N=86

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
2. Discover reasons for student absenteeism.	20.9 54.6	<u>45.3</u> 36.0		19.7 20.9	.23 11.6	11.0 34.9	86
4. Deal with infractions of school rules.	17.6 76.5	<u>82.3</u> 17.6		5.8	5.8	12.9	85
14. Work on truancy problems.	2.3 32.5	<u>44.2</u> 33.7		34.9 40.7		18.6 46.5	86
25. Talk with teachers who have personal problems	7.1	<u>64.4</u> 16.6	1.2	6.0 11.9	19.1 20.2	10.7 32.1	84
27. Substitute occasionally for teachers who must leave their rooms for a short time.	13.1 14.3	<u>75.0</u> 15.4	1.2 5.9		1.2 3.6	9.5 16.6	84
34. Evaluate teacher effectiveness in teaching.	10.9 25.6	<u>86.6</u> 10.9	1.2 6.1		1.2 3.7		82
47. Orient parent groups to new school programs or progress plans.	55.3	<u>91.8</u> 5.9	4.7	3.5 8.2		4.7 29.4	85
55. Contact parents of misbehaving children.	24.4 31.4	<u>60.5</u> 26.7	2.3	3.5 18.6	2.3 16.2	6.9 47.7	86
60. Carry out research dealing with one school.	1.2 44.4	<u>69.1</u> 13.6	3.7 6.2	2.4 9.9	9.9 16.0	13.6 39.5	81

TABLE V

ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS)
SHOWED MOST DISAGREEMENT REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE
STAFF MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
7. Maintain order in the halls.	49.4 42.3	50.5 43.5					85
12. Keep professional infor- mation on I.Q. and achievement tests.	28.8 33.3	29.9 29.9	2.3 20.7	6.9	12.7 25.3	26.4 41.4	87
18. Meet with parent groups sharing common problems.	15.9 42.7	37.8 31.7	1.2 18.3	14.6 37.8	9.8 32.9	20.7 46.3	82
24. Act as liaison with school district pupil personnel staff.	1.2 7.1	47.6 32.1	10.7	8.3 20.2	7.1 16.6	35.7 26.2	84
42. Summarize results of group I.Q. and achievement tests for a school.	3.5 23.5	47.1 17.6	4.7 4.7	1.2	16.4 22.3	28.2 29.4	85
46. Summarize results of group I.Q. and achievement tests for parents.	6.1 19.5	35.3 19.5	1.2 6.1	2.4 2.4	23.2 19.5	31.7 24.4	82
49. Summarize results of group I.Q. and achieve- ment tests for a grade level.	17.6 44.7	30.6 27.0	4.7 9.4	1.2	18.8 15.3	28.2 23.5	85
50. Assist parents in ready- ing pre-schoolers for school.	12.9 36.5	34.0 32.9	1.2 4.7	15.3 9.4	8.2 22.3	28.2 35.3	85
57. Direct research involv- ing more than one school.	13.2	44.5 16.9	8.4 13.2	2.4 13.2	32.5 20.5	12.0 26.5	85
63. Evaluate the effective- ness of tests used in the school district testing program.	14.4 25.3	40.9 28.9	12.0 18.1	8.3	28.9 19.3	3.6 42.2	83

FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS AND SCHOOL SOCIAL
WORKERS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY ALL RESPONDING
GROUPS (EXCLUDING SCHOOL COUNSELORS)

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N.
^a 41. Give individual diagnostic reading tests.	5.8 41.8	1.2 13.9	<u>72.1</u> 16.3	1.2	3.5 17.4	17.4 25.6	86
^b 36. Maintain contacts with welfare agencies.	2.4	7.1 36.9	2.4	<u>70.2</u> 16.6	7.1 29.8	15.5 44.0	84
^c 39. Refer students to community agencies.	4.8 16.9	10.8 22.9	1.2 4.8	<u>48.2</u> 31.3	16.9 24.1	18.1 51.8	83
^d 53. Collect information on home backgrounds.	2.4 28.6	3.5 27.4	3.5	<u>61.9</u> 16.6	4.8 34.5	27.4 53.5	84
^d 59. Make home visits	9.4	1.2 12.9	12.9	<u>56.5</u> 31.8	7.1 41.1	35.3 42.4	85
^e 17. Make appropriate community or home contacts in cases of serious student offenses.	17.8	34.5 30.9	1.2	<u>44.0</u> 28.6	7.1 42.8	14.3 61.9	84

^aCounselors agreed 100% that this function should be performed by the remedial specialists.

^bCounselors were split in their opinion on this item. Three felt that this should be the social worker's responsibility; three thought the psychologist should do it; and one felt that this was the counselor's job.

^cNearly all (6 of 7) of the counselors felt this should be the school psychologist's job.

^dFive of the seven counselors felt this should be their job. Two agreed that item 53 should be a function of the school social worker. On item 59, one counselor felt that this should be the school social worker's duty and one felt that this was up to the school psychologist.

^eThere was considerable disagreement on this item as to who should perform this function by all groups including the counselor group. The counselors were divided as follows: school admin. 1; school soc. wkr. 1; school psych. 3; counselor 2.

Psychologist functions. As seen in Table VII, the school psychologist was perceived as giving in-service training in child development and mental health programs by slightly more than half the composite group. One-third the group thought the psychologist or the administrator should place students in special classes. The majority of respondents also gave the counselor at least a minor responsibility in special class placement.

Counselor functions. Shown on Table VIII counselors were perceived by a majority of the group as responsible for six of the 63 functions. From more to less agreement counselor functions were: (1) provide group guidance to students with problems; (2) hold scheduled interviews with students who will be entering junior high; (3) provide occupational information to classrooms; (4) help children individually with personal problems; (5) talk with children who will be moved to special classes; and (6) summarize results of group tests for an individual child. It is interesting to note that all but (2) and (3) were functions also selected by judges as involving counseling relationships. Judging selections are shown on Table IX.

The item "contact parents of children who are in special classes" resulted in considerable disagreement among respondents as shown on Table X. Personnel groups, including counselors whose responses are shown in Table X footnotes, disagreed considerably on five functions.

Diagnosing individual learning problems was perceived as a responsibility of the remedial specialist, teacher, and psychologist

TABLE VII

FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AS
MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY ALL GROUPS
(EXCLUDING SCHOOL COUNSELORS)

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
^a 29. Place students in special classes.	9.4 40.0	29.4 34.1	8.2 35.3	10.6	<u>35.3</u> 32.9	17.8 55.3	85
^b 45. Give in-service training in child development.	3.6 2.2	6.0 14.4	4.8 6.0	6.0 18.1	<u>60.0</u> 16.8	19.3 39.7	83
^b 54. Develop mental health in-service programs for school staff.	9.8	19.5 19.5	1.2 2.4	6.1 18.3	<u>54.9</u> 14.6	18.3 36.6	82

^aFive of the seven counselors agreed that this should be the school psychologist's job. Two felt, however, that this should be the counselor's responsibility. All groups of respondents disagreed considerably on this item.

^bCounselors were divided in their opinions on these items as to whether they or the school psychologist should perform these functions. On item 45 three counselors gave the responsibility to the psychologist, three gave it to themselves and one felt that this should be a function of the social worker. On item 54, three counselors gave responsibility to the school psychologist and four felt that it should be the counselor's function.

TABLE VIII

FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO COUNSELORS AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES BY
TEACHERS; SCHOOL ADMIN.; REMEDIAL SPECIALISTS; SOCIAL
WORKERS; PSYCHOLOGISTS; AND PUPIL PERSONNEL ADMIN.
N = 86

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
^a 20. Provide occupational information to classrooms.	3.7 41.9	16.1 25.9	3.7 1.2	8.6 14.8	2.5 14.8	<u>65.4</u> 20.9	81
^b 23. Help children individually with personal problems.	17.3 47.1	1.2 34.5	3.5 18.4	3.5 55.2	11.5 49.4	<u>63.2</u> 24.1	87
^b 28. Provide group guidance to students with problems.	2.3 20.9	2.3 16.3	5.8 10.5	1.2 32.6	8.1 50.0	<u>80.4</u> 13.9	86
^a 35. Talk with children who will be moved to special classes.	4.6 43.0	11.6 27.9	4.6 22.1	2.3 17.4	20.9 38.4	<u>55.8</u> 38.4	86
^a 37. Hold scheduled interviews with students who will be entering junior high.	1.2 25.0	22.6 27.4	2.4	1.2 9.5	3.5 9.5	<u>71.4</u> 20.2	84
^a 51. Summarize results of group I.Q. and achievements tests for an individual child.	12.9 32.9	4.7 24.7	7.1 11.8	2.3	24.7 28.2	<u>50.6</u> 25.8	85
^c 61. Contact parents of children who are in special classes.	10.6 28.2	21.2 30.6	10.6 12.9	8.2 23.5	15.3 30.6	<u>34.1</u> 43.5	85

^aAll but one of the seven counselors agreed that these items should be their responsibility. One felt that the school administrator should be responsible for item 20. The opposing counselor gave the teaching staff responsibility for the other items.

^bCounselors agreed 100 percent that these functions should be theirs.

^cCounselors themselves did not see this as a function that they should have. Only two gave themselves the responsibility. Three thought the teacher should perform this function and two felt the psychologist should do it.

TABLE IX

^aITEMS FIVE JUDGES SELECTED AS INVOLVING A COUNSELING RELATIONSHIP;
AND THE ROLE ASSIGNED MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY BY MAJORITY OF
STUDY SUBJECTS N=93

ITEM	FUNCTIONS	NO. OF JUDGES	ROLE
23	Help children individually with personal problems.	5	couns.
^b 28	Provide group guidance to students with problems.	5	couns.
31	Help students to evaluate their own abilities.	5	teach.
^b 35	Talk with children who will be moved to special classes.	5	couns.
25	Talk with teachers who have personal problems.	4	admin.
^b 40	Help students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas.	4	teach.
51	Summarize results of group I.Q. and achievement tests for an individual child.	4	couns.
16	Keep confidential files on some students.	3	couns. & (admin.)
36	Maintain contacts with welfare agencies.	3	soc. wk.
^b 59	Make home visits.	3	soc. wk.
1	Orient new students to school.	2	teach.
21	Be aware of individual student needs.	2	teach.
18	Meet with parent groups sharing common problems.	2	admin.
50	Assist parents in readying pre-schoolers for school.	2	admin.
24	Act as liaison with school district pupil personnel	2	admin. & (couns.)
37	Hold scheduled interviews with students who will be entering junior high.	2	couns.
^b 62	Organize child case conferences for an individual school's staff members.	2	couns.

^aThree of the five judges were experienced counselors at the post-Masters level and two judges were counselor educators.

^bOne judge was not positive about this item.

TABLE X

ITEMS TO WHICH THE RESPONDING GROUPS (EXCLUDING COUNSELORS) SHOWED
MOST DISAGREEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE COUNSELOR OR
PSYCHOLOGIST SHOULD HAVE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY

ROLE OR FUNCTION	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
^a 10. Diagnose individual learning problems.	22.0 48.8	1.2 11.6	26.7 41.8	11.6	22.0 45.3	27.9 43.0	86
^b 16. Keep "confidential" files on some students.	2.3 32.1	38.9 27.6	16.1	1.2 31.0	13.8 41.4	44.8 36.8	87
^a 30. Serve as resource person sex education in school.	3.9 7.8	10.3	1.2	24.7 22.0	36.4 31.2	35.0 38.9	77
^c 52. Give individual intel- ligence tests.	2.3 8.1	8.1	1.2 9.3	2.3	47.7 29.0	48.8 24.4	86
^d 62. Organize child case conferences for an individual school's staff members.	1.2 13.2	22.9 30.1	16.9	2.4 24.1	28.9 25.3	44.6 37.3	83

^aFive of the seven counselors felt that this should be their responsibility. The other two counselors assigned item 10 to the remedial specialist, and one counselor assigned item 30 to the teacher and the second counselor assigned item 30 to the school psychologist.

^bThere was 100 percent agreement among counselors that this function was their responsibility.

^cSix of the seven counselors agreed that this responsibility should be theirs. The other one gave the job to the school psychologist.

^dCounselors were divided in their opinion on this item. Four felt the counselor should have responsibility and the other three thought that this was the school psychologist's function.

in addition to the counselor. Similarly, serving as a resource person in sex education was assigned to counselors, social workers, and psychologists. Some respondents thought the administrator as well as the counselor should keep "confidential files" on some students. Half the respondents felt the counselor should organize child case conferences while about one-fourth each thought the administrator and psychologist should do this.

Respondents were equally divided as to whether the counselor or psychologist should give individual intelligence tests. The counselors themselves thought they should have primary responsibility.

Selected guidance functions. A sample of one-fourth the questionnaire items which most clearly indicate counselor function trends is presented in Table XI. The table also shows differences in each personnel group perceptions of which role should perform certain tasks. The first page of the table contains traditional school psychologist functions. Teachers and administrators were divided in opinion within their groups as to who should perform diagnostic tasks. Administrators, however, agreed that counselors should give individual intelligence tests. It is notable that each pupil personnel administrator selected a different role as responsible for diagnosing individual learning problems.

Page two of Table XI represents traditional counseling relationship functions. Teachers disagreed among themselves on these items. Most groups thought the counselor should help individuals and groups with problems. Nearly half the groups felt "talking with children who

will be moved to special classes" was a psychologist function, while primarily teachers and administrators selected the counselor for this task.

Traditional classroom guidance functions are shown on page three of the table. Most personnel groups were undecided as to whether the teacher or counselor should help students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas; while all groups but the teachers which was divided, felt that providing occupational information to classrooms was a counselor function. The groups saw only the teacher or administrator as mainly responsible for curriculum development.

Page four and five of Table XI include traditional social worker functions and items to which no clear historic pattern was found. These last six items show considerable variation in perceived responsibility of each role within and between each group. Groups were widely scattered in opinion as to who should meet with parent groups sharing common problems, though many gave responsibility to the administrator or counselor. Respondents were divided primarily between social worker and psychologists in regard to making home visits. They were also undecided as to whether the counselor or administrator should act in a liaison role with school district pupil personnel staff. A majority selected the counselor. Most respondents also perceived the psychologist as responsible for in-service training in child development, though about one-third of the groups thought the counselor responsible. The counselor was selected by most groups to organize child case conferences though a large number felt this was a psychologist responsibility.

SELECTED ITEMS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN PERSONNEL GROUP'S
PERCEPTIONS OF WHO SHOULD PERFORM CERTAIN GUIDANCE
FUNCTIONS

FUNCTION	R O L E S						
	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
10. Diagnose individual learning problems.							
Teachers	^a 27.5		25.4		19.6	27.5	51
School Administrators	22.2		16.7		11.1	50.0	18
Remedial Specialists			100.0				5
Social Workers					100.0		3
Psychologists			20.0		80.0		5
Counselors			29.0			71.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.	25.0		25.0		25.0	25.0	4
52. Give individual intelligence tests.							
Teachers	2.0		2.0		48.0	48.0	50 ^b
School Administrators					16.7	83.3	18
Remedial Specialists					60.0	40.0	5
Social Workers					100.0		3
Psychologists					80.0	20.0	5
Counselors					14.0	86.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.					100.0		4
29. Place students in special classes.							
Teachers	19.6	31.4	9.8		23.5	15.7	51
School Administrators		22.2			38.9	38.9	18
Remedial Specialists		40.0	40.0		20.0		5
Social Workers					100.0		3
Psychologists					100.0		5
Counselors					71.0	29.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.		25.0			75.0		4

^aPercentages assigned by persons in each responding group to a role having major responsibility for the function.

^bOne group member omitted this one. Percentages are based on those members who did respond.

TABLE XI (continued)

RESPONDING GROUPS	FUNCTION	R O L E S						
		TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
23.	Help children individually with personal problems.							
	Teachers	18.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	18.0	54.0	50 ^a
	School Administrators	27.8					72.2	18
	Remedial Specialists						100.0	5
	Social Workers						100.0	3
	Psychologists					20.0	80.0	5
	Counselors						100.0	7
28.	Provide group guidance to students with problems.							
	Teachers	2.0	2.0	9.7	2.0	9.7	74.6	51
	School Administrators	5.5				11.1	83.3	18
	Remedial Specialists		20.0				80.0	5
	Social Workers						100.0	3
	Psychologists						100.0	5
	Counselors						100.0	7
35.	Talk with children who will be moved to special classes.							
	Teachers	7.8	9.8	5.9	2.0	15.7	58.8	51
	School Administrators		11.1				88.9	18
	Remedial Specialists		20.0	20.0	20.0		40.0	5
	Social Workers		33.3			33.3	33.3	3
	Psychologists		20.0			80.0		5
	Counselors	14.0					86.0	7
	Pupil Personnel Admin.					100.0		4

^aOne teacher did not respond to the question.

TABLE XI (continued)

FUNCTION	R O L E S						
	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
40. Help students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas.							
Teachers	48.0				32.0	20.0	50 ^a
School Administrators	44.4				11.1	44.4	18
Remedial Specialists	60.0				20.0	20.0	5
Social Workers						100.0	3
Psychologists	40.0					60.0	5
Counselors	57.0					43.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.	50.0					50.0	4
20. Provide occupational information to classrooms.							
Teachers	4.0	23.0	6.0	15.0	4.0	48.0	48 ^b
School Administrators	5.6	11.1				83.3	18
Remedial Specialists						100.0	4 ^a
Social Workers						100.0	3
Psychologists						100.0	5
Counselors		14.0				86.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.						100.0	4
32. Develop the curriculum.							
Teachers	50.0	48.0				2.0	50 ^a
School Administrators	66.7	33.3					18
Remedial Specialists	20.0	80.0					5
Social Workers		100.0					3
Psychologists	25.0	50.0			25.0		4 ^a
Counselors	43.0	57.0					7
Pupil Personnel Admin.	75.0	25.0					4

^aOne member did not respond.

^bThree teachers omitted this function.

TABLE XI (continued)

FUNCTION	R O L E S						
	TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
18. Meet with parent groups sharing common problems.							
Teachers	18.0	36.0	2.0	20.0	10.0	14.0	50 ^a
School Administrators	18.7	50.0				31.3	16 ^b
Remedial Specialists		40.0			20.0	40.0	5
Social Workers		67.0				33.0	3
Psychologists	25.0			25.0	50.0		4 ^a
Counselors	29.0					71.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.		25.0		25.0		50.0	4
59. Make home visits.							
Teachers		2.0		60.7	4.0	33.3	51
School Administrators				38.9		61.1	18
Remedial Specialists				40.0	20.0	40.0	5
Social Workers				100.0			3
Psychologists				75.0		25.0	4 ^a
Counselors				14.5	14.5	71.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.				50.0	50.0		4
24. Act as liaison with school district pupil personnel staff.							
Teachers		58.0	2.0	15.0	6.0	19.0	48 ^c
School Administrators	5.6	38.9			11.1	44.4	18
Remedial Specialists		40.0				60.0	5
Social Workers		33.0				67.0	3
Psychologists		20.0			20.0	60.0	5
Counselors						100.0	7
Pupil Personnel Admin.						100.0	4

^aOne person did not respond.^bTwo administrators did not respond.^cThree teachers left this blank.

TABLE XI (continued)

	FUNCTION	R O L E S						
		TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	N
RESPONDING GROUPS	39. Refer students to community agencies.							
	Teachers	8.0	10.0	2.0	58.0		22.0	50 ^a
	School Administrators		17.6		41.2	23.5	17.6	17 ^a
	Remedial Specialists				40.0	40.0	20.0	5
	Social Workers				100.0			3
	Psychologists					100.0		4 ^a
	Counselors				14.0	86.0		7
	Pupil Personnel Admin.					100.0		4
RESPONDING GROUPS	45. Give in-service training in child development.							
	Teachers	6.1	6.1	6.1	10.2	57.2	14.3	49 ^b
	School Administrators					61.1	38.9	18
	Remedial Specialists		20.0	20.0		40.0	20.0	5
	Social Workers					50.0	50.0	2 ^a
	Psychologists					100.0		5
	Counselors				14.0	43.0	43.0	7
	Pupil Personnel Admin.		25.0			75.0		4
RESPONDING GROUPS	62. Organize child case conferences for an individual school's staff members.							
	Teachers	4.0	26.0		4.0	34.0	32.0	50 ^a
	School Administrators		16.7			22.2	61.1	18
	Remedial Specialists		25.0				75.0	4 ^a
	Social Workers					50.0	50.0	2 ^a
	Psychologists					20.0	80.0	5
	Counselors					43.0	57.0	7
	Pupil Personnel Admin.		25.0			25.0	50.0	4

^aOne member did not respond.^bThree members did not respond.

Correlation Results. ^aTables XII - XVII show correlations between personnel groups' perceptions of each others roles. Most correlations indicate substantial agreement. Table XII shows that the counselor group agreed most with school administrators in perception of all six roles. They seemed to agree least with social workers. Counselors, showed more agreement with psychologists in looking at the psychologist's role than with any other group's perception of this role. Least agreement was seen in comparison between the counselor and teacher's perceptions of the psychologist's role.

As shown in Tables XII, XIII, XIV, and XVI, teachers, like counselors, agreed most with administrators in perceptions of others roles. Also, like counselors, their perceptions were least related to social workers.

School administrators also showed least agreement with social worker perceptions. However, social worker perceptions should be interpreted cautiously as only three were in the group. Administrators had high agreement (.937) with teachers in perception of the teacher's role.

Remedial specialists seemed to agree most with teachers in their role perceptions. This was expected because remedial specialists carry out many teacher activities.

Psychologists agreed most with pupil personnel administrators on the social worker counselor and psychologist roles. They also showed substantial agreement with school administrators on the various roles.

To summarize, in general, there was slightly more agreement on

^aSince whole populations, except for teachers, were used, no statistical tests were employed. Inferences are logical rather than statistical, that is a difference means that one number is larger than another.

^aTABLE XII

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR GROUP'S (N=7) ROLE PERCEPTION
AND OTHER STAFF GROUP'S ROLE PERCEPTIONS BASED ON
TOTAL POINT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE N=93

R O L E S

	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Teach.	.880	.858	.881	.890	.566	.791
Sch. Adm.	.899	.837	.921	.926	.776	.863
Rem. Sp.	.842	.770	.742	.869	.635	.810
Soc. Wkr.	.737	.642	.817	.823	.605	.620
Psych.	.832	.829	.772	.830	.798	.771
Pupil Per.	.789	.734	.921	.839	.765	.787
Adm. (n=4)						

TABLE XIII

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER GROUP'S (N=51) ROLE PERCEPTIONS
AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS

R O L E S

	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Soc. Wkr.	.762	.683	.821	.833	.667	.586
Pupil Per.	.803	.829	.841	.867	.672	.701
Adm.						

^aThe correlations tables all differ in length because duplicate rows of correlations were only shown on one table and omitted on the corresponding one. All correlations in tables IX - XIV are calculated by the Pearson Product - Moment method.

NOTE: The tables should be read like the following example: Table X, row 1, across, - counselor's and teacher's perceptions of the teacher's role correlated .880; counselor's and teacher's perceptions of the administrator's role correlated .858; counselor's and teacher's perceptions of the remedial specialist's role correlated .881, etc.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN REMEDIAL SPECIALIST GROUP'S (N=5) ROLE
PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS

R O L E S						
	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Teach.	.879	.853	.795	.830	.857	.747
Soc. Wkr.	.653	.785	.622	.765	.560	.529
Pupil Per.	.739	.805	.706	.771	.677	.735
Adm.						

TABLE XV

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL WORKER GROUP'S (N=3) ROLE
PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS

R O L E S						
	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Sch. Adm.	.737	.724	.875	.830	.694	.696
Pupil Per.	.735	.627	.831	.724	.645	.723
Adm.						

TABLE XVI

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR GROUP'S (N=18) ROLE
PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS

R O L E S

	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Teach.	.937	.899	.882	.934	.837	.868
Rem. Sp.	.862	.803	.759	.825	.670	.744
Pupil Per.	.829	.771	.918	.838	.780	.762
Adm.						

TABLE XVII

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S GROUP (N=5) ROLE
PERCEPTIONS AND OTHER STAFF GROUP ROLE PERCEPTIONS

R O L E S

	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.
Teach.	.828	.870	.789	.882	.772	.670
Sch. Adm.	.838	.855	.809	.848	.824	.737
Rem. Sp.	.709	.819	.809	.751	.725	.699
Soc. Wkr.	.776	.665	.723	.832	.663	.715
Pupil Per.	.805	.825	.757	.898	.889	.831
Adm.						

the counselor role as indicated by each pair of correlations (see Tables XII - XVII) than on the psychologist role. Most groups substantially agreed in their perceptions of the social worker role; however, the social worker group agreed least with each other group on their perceptions of other roles. Administrators tended to agree most with each group's perceptions of other personnel roles.

Related findings. Data related to additional aspects of role perception are shown in Tables XVIII, XIV, and XX. Table XVIII shows incidences of agreement within each personnel group as to who should have major responsibility for certain functions. Groups agreed most on teacher responsibilities and slightly less on administrative functions. Of the four specialist roles most agreements within groups were seen in regard to counselor tasks. There was least agreement on social worker functions.

Probability ratios indicate that chance alone would not account for any of these agreements. However, only groups of similar size are directly comparable in amount of agreement, for example, the remedial specialist and psychologist groups. The counselor group shows considerable agreement for its size, particularly in relationship to smaller groups who had less agreement. The high social worker group agreement is not overly significant since there were only three in the group, and one member omitted several items. Even with their comparatively large sizes, it is surprising that teachers and administrators did not agree on any one item for any of the four specialist roles. The four pupil

TABLE XVIII

INSTANCES OF 100% AGREEMENT WITHIN RESPONDING GROUPS ON
THE ASSIGNMENT OF MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES ON 63
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR EACH STAFF ROLE

R O L E S

RESPONDING GROUPS	GROUP N		TEACH.	ADM.	REM. SPEC.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	TOTAL ITEMS OF AGREE.	% OF 63
	51	Teach.	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.2
	18	Admin.	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	4.8
	5	Rem. Sp.	5	4	2	0	0	2	13	20.1
	3	Soc. Wkr.	3	8	0	4	3	5	24	38.1
	5	Psych.	5	1	1	0	2	2	11	17.5
	7	Couns.	9	3	1	0	0	4	17	27.0
	4	Pupil Per. Adm.	6	3	0	0	3	5	17	27.0

TABLE XIX

MEAN NUMBER OF POINTS ASSIGNED TO EACH PUPIL PERSONNEL ROLE
ON THE 63 ITEMS OF THE "WHOSE JOB IS IT?" QUESTION-
NAIRE BY EACH SCHOOL STAFF GROUP N=93

R O L E S

RESPONDING GROUPS	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	^a COUNS.	
	Teach.	1.53	1.35	.42	.63	.88	1.29
	Admin.	1.66	1.76	.36	.50	.83	1.69
	Rem. Sp.	1.33	1.48	.77	.54	.88	1.40
	Soc. Wkr.	.83	1.09	.16	.65	.98	1.43
	Psych.	1.51	1.50	.51	.72	1.24	1.67
	Couns.	1.59	1.36	.32	.36	.83	1.82
	Pupil Per.	1.48	1.65	.26	.66	1.10	1.74
	Adm.						
TOTAL	9.93	10.19	2.80	4.06	6.74	11.04	

TABLE XX

STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TABLE XIX MEANS OF PUPIL PERSONNEL
ROLE FUNCTIONS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

R O L E S

RESPONDING GROUPS								
	^b N	TEACH.	ADMIN.	REM. SP.	SOC. WKR.	PSYCH.	COUNS.	
	Teach.	51	.845	.660	.431	.606	.524	.552
	Admin.	18	.817	.627	.417	.516	.476	.687
	Rem. Sp.	5	.883	.774	.738	.681	.674	.806
	Soc. Wkr.	3	1.025	1.073	.424	.934	.837	.860
	Psych.	5	.854	.758	.597	.793	.867	.740
	Couns.	7	.975	.794	.549	.559	.778	.840
	Pupil Per. Adm.	4	.984	.757	.487	.778	.918	.726

^aNote that each responding group except for teachers assigned the counseling role with the highest mean number of points of responsibility.

^bSince the size of each responding group differs considerably standard deviations are not directly comparable between groups; however they can be compared horizontally.

personnel administrators did not agree on any remedial specialist or social worker items; also there was no agreement between remedial specialists and counselors on any social worker or psychologist functions.

Table XIX shows the mean number of points assigned by individual group members to each of the six roles. In order of weight of responsibility from greatest to least these were: counselor, administrator, teacher, psychologist, social worker and remedial specialist. Every group excepting social workers gave itself more points.

Standard deviations based on means in Table XIX are seen in Table XX. Few trends are notable. Teachers appeared to deviate less in perception of specialist's roles than of administrators and their own. Administrators deviated most in their assignment of function points to teachers and counselors, and deviated least regarding remedial specialists and social workers.

II. STUDY SUPPOSITIONS

1. Members within the total responding pupil personnel and school staff group will disagree on the role and function of the elementary school counselor; no questionnaire items will be assigned to the counselor as a major responsibility by more than 75% of the total group.

Evidence related to this is shown in Tables VIII, X, and XI. This supposition was supported with three exceptions: (1) item 28, "provide group guidance to students with problems," to which an average

of 91% of all groups gave responsibility to the counselor; (2) item 23, "help children individually with personal problems," which an average of 86.6% of all groups gave responsibility to the counselor (nearly half the teachers gave this responsibility to themselves, however); and (3) item 20, "provide occupational information to classrooms" to which an average of 88% of the group responded in favor of the counselor. The teachers again were an exception to this trend as only 48% of them assigned the counselor this duty.

2. Individual school staff and other personnel staff members will ascribe the counselor "counseling" functions primarily to the counselor.

Table IX shows that this supposition was partially supported. The counselor was assigned four of seven counseling tasks on which judges showed most agreement. The teacher was given two and the administrator one counseling duties.

3. Functions such as curriculum development and in-service training of teachers which characterize a developmentalist role will be assigned to personnel other than the counselor.

This supposition was supported. Only one respondent, a teacher, gave the counselor major responsibility in curriculum development, and only 13.2% of the composite group gave the counselor a minor responsibility in this area. Individual group responses to these functions are seen in Table XI. In-service training in child development and mental health programs was assigned primarily to the psychologist, though about one-fifth the respondents assigned this to the counselor.

However, nearly 40% gave counselors minor responsibility in in-service training. More than half of all groups, except teachers, perceived the organization of case conferences, a type of in-service training, as the counselor. Counselors themselves were split in opinion as to whether they or the school psychologist should give in-service training. No counselor gave himself a major responsibility for curriculum development.

4. Counselors will disagree with each other on their role and responsibilities related to functions traditionally carried out by school psychologists and school social workers as measured by item responses on the questionnaire.

Social worker and psychologist functions are described in Chapter III. This supposition was supported as shown in Tables VI, VII, VIII, X, and XI. Counselors disagreed among themselves whether or not it was their responsibility to: (1) maintain contacts with welfare agencies; (2) refer students to community agencies; (3) collect information on home backgrounds; (4) make home visits; (5) make appropriate contacts in cases of serious student offences; (6) place students in special classes; (7) contact parents of children in special classes; and (8) diagnose individual learning problems.

5. One aspect of the need for elementary school counselors in the school district studied will be shown by the weight of responsibility for functions assigned the elementary counselor.

Support for this supposition is shown throughout most tables. Counselors were assigned major or minor responsibility for 40 of the

63 functions questionnaire. In addition, Table XIX shows that the counselor was assigned the highest total mean points of all groups--11.04, nearly one point above the next highest, administrative role. Teachers assigned the counselor role the least number of total points. It is interesting that administrators assigned more points to counselors than to teachers, though not significantly so (+.03). Counselors gave themselves the highest mean point total, followed by pupil personnel administrators.

6. Elementary school teachers and administrators perceive the role of the counselor, psychologist and social worker similarly; the correlation between their perceptions of the three roles will be high.

This supposition was supported as shown in Table XVI. The administrators and teacher's perceptions as shown by Pearson "r" correlations are: counselor's role .868; psychologist's role .837; and social worker's role .934.

7. Pupil personnel administrators, remedial specialists and social workers will perceive the role of the psychologist and role of the social worker more similarly than they perceive the role of the counselor; the correlations between these three groups will be higher for the psychologist role and social worker role, than for the counselor role.

This supposition was only partially supported as indicated in Tables XII - XVI. The three groups agreed most on the social worker

role and least on the psychologist role. Remedial specialists and social workers showed little agreement on either the psychologist or counselor role. Pupil personnel administrators agreed more with remedial specialists than with social workers. The conflict in psychologist versus counselor functions was more apparent in the group perceptions of the psychologist role than of the counselor. This was also evident in the pilot study to establish questionnaire reliability. Perceptions of the psychologist role was least reliable.

Interpretation of Findings

In summary, several trends regarding perceived counselor role in Edmonton seem evident from data shown on preceding tables.

1. The counselor is perceived as a combination counselor, psychologist and social worker, involved in almost every aspect of school life. Pupil personnel groups see the counselor neither as a problem-centered "traditionalist" nor as a "developmentalist." The perceived counselor role appears most similar to the "neo-traditionalist," or counselor in transition (Faust, 1968) which heavily emphasizes counseling, some testing and diagnosis, and considerable parent work.
2. Teachers may perceive the counselor as a threat to their traditional guidance role as shown by reluctance in many cases to assign counseling functions to the counselor.
3. Principals in some instances, also see the teacher as the guidance counselor, and as a result tend to assign diagnostic, and home and community functions rather than primarily counseling ones. This may

also occur because the counselor is the resource person most available to the administrator.

4. Specialists, though protective of their own perceived functions, tend to view the counselor as carrying considerable guidance responsibility, particularly in child-related activities.

5. Counselor testing functions are perceived by teachers and administrators as important.

6. In-service training curriculum development functions proposed by Faust (1968) as developmentalist ones, are not perceived as counselor functions in the present study. However, there is possibly a trend for counselor involvement in in-service training.

7. Generally, teacher and administrator perceptions found in the present research are similar to those reported in recent United States' studies of guidance personnel role and functions.

8. Finally, counselors themselves appear unsure as to what their role should be.

Factors influencing the present study. Several factors in the organization of the school district studied undoubtedly influenced perceptions of the various personnel roles. Remedial specialists, social workers and psychologists all serve a much larger geographical area than do counselors, hence their activities are less known to individual teachers, and administrators. Also since the great majority of Edmonton Public Schools do not have elementary school counselors, psychologists

and social workers perform many counselor-type tasks. They also tend not to spend much time working in schools which have counselor services. The counselor as a result is often called upon to carry out psychologist and social worker functions. Also, counselors are the only functionairies who have an office in each school and are directly responsible to the principal. They do not work from a central office as other specialists do.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Elementary school counselors have existed in America for nearly four decades, however only recently has this professional role been "activated." Events in the guidance, testing, child study, and mental health movements, and current federal government support have helped create a climate of acceptance for elementary school counseling. Increased recognition of the need to prevent human failure has established a rationale for providing the classroom teacher with guidance resource personnel. Guidance is an integral part of all children's education--a recognition which has resulted in a re-definition of the counselor's role from a diagnostic - crisis orientation to the broader concept of a counselor involved in the development of all children. This developmental conception appears to encompass three roles--counseling, consulting and coordination.

Re-examination of counselor role, accompanying re-definition, has pointed to many areas of conflict and overlap in guidance functions among school psychologists, school social workers and counselors. This polemic has encouraged the generation of several studies of guidance personnel role and function. The present research, an expansion of previous studies, has also shown areas of agreement and disagreement related to perceived counselor and guidance personnel functions.

The traditional concept of elementary school counselor activities presently appears in a state of transition, possibly evolving toward a more developmental conception. However, though this newer view of guidance is verbally accepted, as discussed in Chapters II and III, practitioners and school staffs continue to perform functions according to outmoded role definitions and guidance goals. This was evident in the present study as well as in studies recently reported by other researchers.

II. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND SUGGESTIONS FOR EDUCATION

Implications For Further Research

1. Future researchers should use larger personnel groups than was available for the present study. Possibly two school districts similar in locale and stage of guidance program development could be compared as to personnel role and functions.
2. Evidence was found in the present research that the counselor is perceived as involved in numerous school functions. Another study might concentrate on the number of times and particular areas in which personnel groups see the counselor as involved in these tasks - extent of involvement.
3. Still another study could use a scale type of opinionnaire where various counselor functions are rated by the counselor and others as to their relative importance as counselor functions - quality of involvement.
4. A fourth research might involve studying a school system which appears to practice developmental guidance to ascertain if the curriculum involvement, in-service training, teacher counseling, and teacher consulting

functions, are found to a greater degree than was found in the present study and other reported ones.

Suggestions For Education

1. A suggested solution to the problem of conflict in guidance personnel functions is found in Faust's (1968) and other's proposal that the counselor function primarily as a consultant to teachers. This support and assistance to teachers would probably influence the learning of many more children than is possible from a one-to-one counseling basis. Neither enough personnel nor time will probably ever permit the counselor to help every child individually. Another obvious implication is that school learning environments are determined to a large extent by teacher's mental health, as first noted by Burnham (Chapter II) in 1928.
2. Possibly the counselor can influence what and how children learn by becoming involved in curriculum development and in-service training of school staff. To do these things the counselor will have to relinquish many testing, crisis counseling, and home involvement functions to other specialists. The counselor's counseling time probably should be spent more with groups of children and with individual teachers and groups of educators rather than with individual children.
3. An implication from child development research is that counselors should invest much of their time working with young children where efforts are likely to have greatest influence for the child's future.

In conclusion, it is suggested that the counselor's efforts in providing optimal learning climates for children would help prevent many social, emotional, and academic failures.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

American Personnel and Guidance Association. Dallas Convention Abstracts, 1967.

American School Counselor's Association. Elementary School Guidance Committee. Dimensions of elementary school guidance, October, 1964, 17. (Tentative draft).

Arbuckle, D.S. Counselor, social worker, psychologist: let's 'ecumenicalize.' Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 65, 532-540.

Arbuckle, D.S. Occupational information in the elementary school. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1963-64, 12, 77-84.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Perceiving, behaving, becoming. Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1962.

Aubrey, R.F. The legitimacy of elementary school counseling: some unresolved issues and conflicts. American Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 65, 355-359.

Barr, J.A. The elementary teacher and guidance. New York: Holt-Dryden, 1958.

Barry, R. and Wolf, B. Modern issues in guidance-personnel work. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1957.

Beck, E.E. Philosophical foundations of guidance. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Bernard, H.W., James, C.E. and Zeran, F.R. Guidance in elementary schools. New York: Chartwell House, 1954.

Biddle, B.J. and Thomas, E.J. (Eds.). Role theory: concepts and research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Blocher, D.H. Developmental counseling: a rationale for counseling in the elementary school. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1968, 2 (3), 163-172.

Bloom, B. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Boney, J.D. and Glofka, P. Counselor educators' and teachers' perceptions of elementary counselor functions. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7, 3-7.

- Bosdell, B.J. Guidance functions of elementary school personnel. Guidance Journal, 1961, 1, 47-54.
- Brown, D. and Pruett, R.F. The elementary teacher views guidance. The School Counselor, 1967, 14, 195-203.
- Byrne, R.H. For elementary schools: a human development specialist? Educational Leadership, 1963, 21, 8-10.
- Children in a changing world. Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Conant, J. The American high school today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Connecticut State Department of Education. The team approach in pupil personnel services. Hartford, Conn.: The Department, 1955.
- Cottingham, H.F. Guidance in elementary schools. Bloomington, Ill.: McKnight and McKnight, 1956.
- Cottingham, H.F. Guidance in the elementary school--a status review. A speech presented to the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Boston, April, 1963. In E.D. Koplitz (Ed.) Guidance in the elementary school: theory, research and practice. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1968.
- Cottingham, H.F. National-level projection for elementary school guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1966, XLIV, 499-502. (a)
- Cottingham, H.F. The counselor's role in elementary school guidance. The High School Journal. 1966, 49 (5), 204-208. (b)
- Cutts, N.E. (Ed.). School psychologists at mid-century. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1955, 16-25.
- Detjen, E.W. and Detjen, M.F. Elementary school guidance. (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
- DeVries, R.T. The principal's responsibilities in the guidance program. The National Elementary Principal, 1964, XLIII (5), 47-49.
- Dinkmeyer, D.C. The consultant in elementary school guidance. Guidance Journal, 1962, 1.
- Dinkmeyer, D.C. Developmental counseling in the elementary school. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 262-266.

- Dinkmeyer, D.C. Guidance and counseling in the elementary school: readings in theory and practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Driscoll, G. Child guidance in the classroom. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1955.
- Eckerson, L.O. Realities confronting elementary school guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 65, 350-354.
- Eckerson, L.O. and Smith, H.M. Elementary school guidance: the consultant. School Life, 1962, 44 (9).
- Edmonton Journal. Sex educational project proposed. Edmonton, Alberta, March 23, 1968.
- Educational Policies Commission. The central purpose of American education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1961.
- Faust, V. Role of the elementary school counselor: freeing children to learn. An address to the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1966.
- Faust, V. The counselor as a consultant to teachers. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (2), 112-117.
- Faust, V. History of elementary school counseling: critique and overview. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Foster, C.M. Perceptions of the role and function of the elementary school counselor. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University), Indiana, 1965.
- Gannon, F.B. and Peterson, R.L. An outline for elementary school guidance: the need, philosophy, and program. New York State Education, 1963, 50 (2).
- Gatchel, H.H. The elementary classroom teacher's personal opinion concerning several aspects of an organized guidance program at that level. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma), Norman, Oklahoma, 1958.
- Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. Predicting delinquency and crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959, 114-115.
- Goldman, L. Group guidance content and process. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 39 (6).

- Gordon, I.J. The teacher as a guidance worker. New York: Harper, 1956.
- Grant, C.W. Guidance foci in elementary schools. Frontiers of Elementary Education, 1954, 1.
- Harrison, E.L. The elementary school counselor's unique position. The School Counselor, 1963, 11 (2), 107-109.
- Hart, R.N. Are elementary counselors doing the job? The School Counselor, 1961, 9 (3), 70-72.
- Hatch, R.N. Guidance services in the elementary schools. Iowa: William C. Brown, 1951.
- Hill, G.E. The start of a continuous program in guidance in elementary schools. The Clearing House, 1963, 38 (2).
- Hill, G.E. Guidance in elementary schools. A position paper presented to the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Committee on dimensions in elementary school guidance, 1964.
- Hill, G.E. Institute on guidance and testing in the elementary school. Chicago: Science Research Associates, June, 1965.
- Hill, G.E. Guidance in the elementary schools. Colorado Guidance Newsletter, 1966, XVIII (3). In E.D. Koplitz. Guidance in the elementary school: theory, research and practice, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1968, 69.
- Hill, G.E. Agreements in the practice of guidance in the elementary schools. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (3), 188-195.
- Homans, G.D. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950.
- Johnston, E.G. Waterford studies elementary school guidance. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1966, 1 (3).
- Johnston, E.G., Peters, M. and Evraiff, W. The role of the teacher in guidance. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Kaback, G. Automation, work, and leisure: implications for elementary education. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1965, 13 (3), 202-208.
- Kaback, G. Occupational information for groups of elementary school children. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly. 1966, 14 (3), 163-168.
- Kaczkowski, H.R. The elementary school counselor as consultant. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (2), 103-111.

- Kagan, J. and Moss, H. Birth to maturity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.
- Kennedy, E.C. Child development specialists and school counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, V (3), 159-162.
- Kentucky Committee, Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Perceptions of the elementary school counselor. A report presented to SACESC, New Orleans, Louisiana, October, 1966.
- Koepe, R.P. Elementary school guidance. In C.E. Beck, Guidelines for guidance. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1966, 176-198.
- Koepe, R.P. Issues in initiating and implementing the services of an elementary school counselor. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (1), 41-46.
- Kowitz, G.T. and Kowitz, N.G. Improving home-school relations. The National Elementary Principal. 1964, 63 (5), 22-25.
- Lee, J.M. and Pallone, N.J. Guidance and counseling in schools: foundations and processes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966
- Leonard, G.E. The coordinative role. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dallas Convention Abstracts, 1967, 89.
- Lifton, W.M. Social forces and guidance in the elementary school. The Vocational Guidance Journal, 1963-64, 12 (2), 89-92.
- Lloyd-Jones, E., Barry, R. and Wolf, B. Guidance in elementary education: a casebook. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1958.
- Los Angeles County Superintendent of School's Office. Guiding today's children. Los Angeles: California Test Bureau, 1959.
- Luckey, E.B. The elementary school counselor: counselor for parents. The School Counselor, 1967, 14, 204-209.
- Martinson, R.A. Duties of elementary school counselors. Occupations, 1951, XXX (5), 167-170.
- Martinson, R.A. and Smallenburg, H. Guidance in elementary schools. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- Maslow, A.H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

- Mayer, G.R. An approach for the elementary counselor: consultant or counselor: The School Counselor, March 1967, 14, 210-213.
- Mayer, G.R.: and Munger, P.F. A plea for letting the elementary counselor counsel. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6 (4), 341-346.
- McCreary, W.H. and Miller, G. Elementary school counselors in California, Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, XLIV (5), 494-498.
- McDougall, W.P. and Reitan, H.M. The elementary counselor as perceived by elementary principals. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 348-354.
- McKellar, R.L. A study of concepts, functions, and organizational characteristics of guidance in the elementary school as reported by selected elementary school guidance personnel. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University), Florida, 1963.
- Meeks, A. Elementary school counseling. The School Counselor, 1962, 10.
- Meeks, A. Dimensions of elementary school guidance. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (3), 163-187.
- Miller, C.H. Foundations of guidance. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Muro, J.J. The elementary guidance specialist as perceived by elementary school teachers and elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia), Athens, Georgia, 1965.
- Muro, J.J. and Oelke, M.C. Guidance needs in the elementary school--cue to the preparation of counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7 (1), 7-10.
- Nelson, R.C. Issues and dialogue. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (3), 263-269.
- Nitzschke, D.R. and Hill, G.E. The elementary school counselor: preparation and functions. Athens, Ohio: Center for Educational Research and Services, College of Education, Ohio University, 1964.
- Nitzschke, D.F. and Sorohan, L.J. Elementary school guidance--what should we do? Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7 (1), 20-24.
- Norris, W., Zeran, F. and Hatch, R.N. The information service in guidance. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.
- Ohlsen, M.M. A rationale for the elementary school counselor. Guidance Journal, 1966, 5 (2).
- Oldridge, B. Two roles for elementary school guidance personnel. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43 (4), 367-370.

- Patouillet, R. Organizing for guidance in the elementary school. Teachers College Record, 1957, 58 (8), 435-442.
- Pearman, J. and Burrows, A.H. Social services in the school. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1955.
- Peters, H.J. Counseling children in the elementary school. In D.C. Dinkmeyer, Guidance and counseling in the elementary school: readings in theory and practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Peters, H.J. and Hansen, J.C. The school counselor as a researcher. The School Counselor, March 1964, 11, 165-170.
- Peters, H.J., Shertzer, B. and Van Hoose, W.H. Guidance in elementary schools. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Poling, G. Why guidance in elementary schools? South Dakota Education Journal, 1966, 41 (4).
- Prescott, D. Helping teachers understand children.
- Raines, B.G. A study of the role of the counselor in the elementary schools of Ohio. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University), Athens, Ohio, 1964.
- Roeber, E.C. The school counselor. Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963, vii.
- Rogers, Carl R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1942.
- Shuster, A.H. and Ploghoft, M.E. The emerging elementary curriculum. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1963.
- Science Research Associates, In. Roles of guidance workers in the elementary schools. SRA Guidance Newsletter, November 1960.
- Shertzer, B. and Lundy, C.T. Administrator's image of a school counselor. The School Counselor, 1964, 11, 211-214.
- Shertzer, B. and Pruett, R.F. Guidance in the elementary schools. Bulletin No. 247. Indianapolis: Indiana Dept. of Public Instruction, September, 1961.
- Smallenburg, H. Studying the elementary guidance program. The National Elementary Principal, 1964, 53 (5), 15-18.
- Smith, H.M. Preventing difficulties through elementary school guidance. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1 (1), 8-14.

- Smith, H.M. and Eckerson, L.O. Guidance for children in elementary schools. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1963.
- Smith, H.M. and Eckerson, L.O. Guidance services in elementary schools--a national survey. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.
- Social Dynamite. The report of the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas. National Committee for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C. 1961.
- Spence, L.C. Guidance activities of the school social worker. Guidance for today's children. 33rd Yearbook of the National Education Association, Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, 1954.
- Staub, W.F. An administrator's thoughts about counseling. A paper presented at the Ohio State University, Athens, Ohio, March, 1962.
- Stefflre, B. Research in guidance: horizons for the future. Theory Into Practice, 1963, 2 (1), 44-50.
- Strang, R.M. The role of the teacher in personnel work. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1953.
- Van Hoose, W.H. The consulting role. American Personnel and Guidance Association. Dallas Convention Abstracts, 1967, 241.
- Van Hoose, W.H., Peters, M. and Leonard G.E. The elementary school counselor. Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1967.
- Watson, D. A teacher looks at guidance. The National Elementary Principal, 1964, 63 (5), 37-40.
- Wellington, J.A. and Olechowski, N. Attitudes toward the world of work in elementary schools. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1966, 14 (3).
- Willey, R.O. and Dunn, M. The role of the teacher in the guidance program. Illinois: McKnight and McKnight, 1964.
- Wilson, F.M. Guidance in elementary schools. Occupations, 1951, 29 (3).
- Williamson, E.G. How to counsel students. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.
- Wrenn, C.G. Training of vocational guidance workers. Occupations, 1951, 29, 414-419.

Wrenn, C.G. The counselor in a changing world. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1962.

Wrenn, C.G. The counselor in a changing world revisited. Teacher's College Journal, Terre Haute, Indiana, Indiana State College, 1964.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

"Whose Job Is It?" Questionnaire

"WHOSE JOB IS IT?"

1. What is your position in the school system? (Please circle one)
 - a) teacher b) administrator c) school counselor
 - d) remedial specialist e) school psychologist f) school social worker
2. If you are a teacher or an administrator please write the name of your school: _____

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: In the education of children - teachers, administrators, counselors, school psychologists, school social workers and remedial specialists all have partial responsibility for certain tasks involved in carrying out the school program. In order for the educational process to function smoothly it is assumed that certain tasks tend to be carried out by some members of the team and other tasks are not. The following questionnaire was designed to help clarify the various duties of school personnel. Your cooperation in filling it out is appreciated.

HOW TO FILL OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE: Please check each item by the following key:

- "3" - the part of the school staff who should have major or sole responsibility for the task.
- "2" - the part of the school staff who should have partial responsibility for the task.
- "1" - the part of the school staff who should be involved, but who should have little or no direct responsibility.

FIRST: Decide the one part of the school staff who should have major responsibility for the tasks and then place a "3" in that column space. Only one part of the school staff should be indicated as having major responsibility.

SECOND: Decide what the role of the other five parts of the school staff should be and then place the appropriate number in the remaining column spaces. These five remaining staff parts may have the same role; in that case place the same number "2" or "1" in the spaces. If you feel that they have different roles, then place different numbers in the column spaces. If any of the remaining parts do not have a role leave the column space blank. NO COLUMN SPACE SHOULD HAVE MORE THAN ONE NUMBER IN IT.

EXAMPLES	Teaching Staff	Admin. Staff	Remedial Specialist	School Social Worker	School Psychologist	School Counselor
01. Concerned with student morale	2	3	1	1	1	2
02. Gives "projective" tests					3	1
03. Schedules school assemblies	2	3				
04. Files report cards	3	2				

REMEMBER: You may have any combination of "1's" or "2's", but only one "3".

Use the numbers "3", "2" and "1" to indicate how the teaching staff, administrative staff, counselor, school psychologist, school social worker and remedial (reading) specialist should be involved in each task.

"3" - Major Responsibility
 "2" - Partial Responsibility
 "1" - Should Be Involved

Please make a decision for each item even if you are not fully certain. In every row at least one column should be checked, but not every square need have a number in it. Remember that each row may have only one "3" in it.

	Teach. Staff	Admin. Staff	Remed. Spec.	School Social Worker	School Psych.	School Couns.
1. Orient new students to school.						
2. Discover reasons for student absenteeism.						
3. Keep school cumulative records up to date.						
4. Deal with infractions of school rules.						
5. Help maintain "healthy" classroom environment.						
6. Provide students with study habit "hints".						
7. Maintain order in the halls.						
8. Encourage student participation in school and city activities.						
9. Enter group test results in cumulative record files.						
10. Diagnose individual learning problems.						
11. Deal with student behavior problems in the classroom.						
12. Keep professional information on I.Q. and achievement tests.						
13. Supervise extra-curricular activities.						
14. Work on truancy problems.						
15. Fail and accelerate students.						
16. Keep "confidential" files on some students.						
17. Make appropriate community or home contacts in cases of serious student offences.						

	Teach. Staff	Admin. Staff	Remed. Spec.	School Social Worker	School Psych.	School Couns.
18. Meet with parent groups sharing common problems.						
19. Identify children with learning problems.						
20. Provide occupational information to classrooms.						
21. Be aware of individual student needs.						
22. Give instruction in sex education to students.						
23. Help children individually with personal problems.						
24. Act as liaison with school district pupil personnel staff.						
25. Talk with teachers who have personal problems.						
26. Help "gifted" children to develop their potential.						
27. Substitute occasionally for teachers who must leave their rooms for a short time.						
28. Provide group guidance to students with problems.						
29. Place students in "special classes".						
30. Serve as resource person in school sex education.						
31. Help students to evaluate their own abilities.						
32. Develop the curriculum.						
33. Have class discussions on personality-behavior topics.						
34. Evaluate teacher effectiveness in teaching.						
35. Talk with children who will be moved to special classes.						
36. Maintain contacts with welfare agencies.						
37. Hold scheduled interviews with students who will be entering junior high.						
38. Teach academic subjects.						
39. Refer students to community agencies.						
40. Help students to develop in personal-social-emotional areas.						

	Teach. Staff	Admin. Staff	Remed. Spec.	School Social Worker	School Psych.	School Couns.
41. Give individual diagnostic reading tests.						
42. Summarize results of I.Q. & achievement tests for a school.						
43. Contact parents of children who aren't doing their home-work.						
44. Give group intelligence tests.						
45. Give in-service training in child development.						
46. Summarize results of group I.Q. & achievement tests for parents.						
47. Orient parent groups to new school programs or progress plans.						
48. Carry out research in individual classrooms.						
49. Summarize results of group I.Q. & achievement tests for a grade level.						
50. Assist parents in readying pre-schoolers for school.						
51. Summarize results of group I.Q. & achievement tests for an individual child.						
52. Give individual intelligence tests.						
53. Collect information on home backgrounds.						
54. Develop mental health in-service programs for school staff.						
55. Contact parents of misbehaving children.						
56. Summarize results of group I.Q. & achievement tests for a classroom.						
57. Direct research involving more than one school.						
58. Give group achievement tests.						
59. Make home visits.						
60. Carry out research dealing with one school.						
61. Contact parents of children who are in "special classes".						
62. Organize child case conferences for an individual school's staff members.						
63. Evaluate the effectiveness of tests used in the school district testing program.						

THANK YOU FOR TAKING YOUR TIME TO FILL THIS OUT AND HELP WITH THIS STUDY. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT EACH ROW HAS AT LEAST ONE "3" IN IT, BUT NO MORE THAN ONE "3".

APPENDIX B

Form letters to study participants

Dear Elementary School Teacher or Administrator,

As you may know, your school is one of 19 in Edmonton which is served by an elementary school counselor. For this reason your school staff may have different functions or tasks than schools which do not have a counselor. Also the pupil personnel staff which serves your school--remedial specialist, school psychologist, and school social worker--may offer slightly different services than if they were serving a school which did not have a counselor.

The elementary school counselor has appeared on the North American educational scene relatively recently. Because of this there exists a great deal of confusion as to what the tasks of a counselor should be in relation to other staff members. In order to try to more clearly define responsibility for these roles and functions, I have developed the enclosed questionnaire, "Whose Job Is It?" Two, three, or four teachers from your school, depending on the total number of staff members, were drawn randomly from an alphabetical list. One administrator from each school was also asked to participate. This is how you were selected to participate in this study. You as individuals representing a certain school can give an indication of how all teachers in your school perceive the roles and functions of various staff members. Please contribute approximately 30 minutes of your time by filling out this questionnaire. Your help is sincerely appreciated.

To simplify collection of questionnaires which will not be identified by name or by school, the counselor has agreed to allow me to place an envelope in his or her box in your school to which you can return the completed questionnaire. The names of staff members in your school who have been sampled are listed on the front of the envelope. Would you please cross your name off of the list after you have returned your questionnaire so that I can determine when all of the papers have been returned? Please try to return it within two days.

When the study is completed I would be happy to discuss the results with you personally or with your staff if you are interested.

If it is not possible for you to participate in this study, I would appreciate your notifying me (evenings at 439-6061) so that an alternate name from your school can be drawn. It is important that each school has equal representation in the study and so a 100% return is extremely important.

Thank you so much for your help and your time.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Mary Christmas, Graduate
Student in Elem. Counseling,
University of Alberta

January 1968

Dear

As you know, 19 of Edmonton's elementary schools are served by elementary school counselors. For this reason, the staff members of these schools may have different functions or tasks than schools which do not have a counselor. Also as pupil personnel staff members serving these schools, you may offer slightly different services to these schools than if you were serving schools which did not have elementary school counselors.

The elementary school counselor has appeared on the educational scene in North America relatively recently. Because of this there exists a great deal of confusion as to what the tasks of a counselor should be in relation to other staff members. In order to try and more clearly define responsibility for these roles and functions, I have developed the enclosed questionnaire, "Whose Job Is It?" All of the remedial specialists, school psychologists and school social workers who serve schools which are also served by elementary counselors are asked to take part in this study. Will you please take the approximately 30 minutes of time necessary to fill out this questionnaire? Your help is appreciated.

To simplify collection of questionnaires which will not be identified by name, a large manilla envelope will be left with Miss Gunderson, Dr. Hohol's secretary, to which you can return the completed questionnaire. The names of staff members in your department are listed on the front of the envelope. Would you please cross your name off of the list after you have returned your questionnaire so that I can determine when all of the papers have been returned? Please try to return the completed forms within two days.

When the study is completed I would be happy to discuss the results with you personally or with your particular professional group. Hopefully this instrument will be valuable in showing how your role is perceived by others. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have regarding the questionnaire or the study. My phone number, evenings, is 439-6061.

Because of the small number of you who work with elementary counselors, it is extremely important that all of you are represented in the compilation of results for your particular profession.

Thank you so much for your help and your time.

Sincerely,

Mary Christmas, Graduate
Student in Elem. Counseling,
University of Alberta

B29881